



239
P547

W. B. Harrison

LETTERS

TO

CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ. ... /

ON THE

THEOLOGICAL PARTS

OF HIS

BOOK OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH,

WITH

REMARKS ON CERTAIN WORKS OF DR. MILNER, AND DR. LINGARD,
AND ON SOME PARTS OF THE EVIDENCE OF DR. DOYLE
BEFORE THE TWO COMMITTEES OF THE
HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

BY

REV. HENRY PHILLPOTTS, D.D.
RECTOR OF STANHOPE.

SECOND EDITION.

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

122183

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

MDCCCXXVI.

1847

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

5480

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

TO

THE HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND

SHUTE,

LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM.

MY LORD,

I VENTURE, without previously soliciting permission, to inscribe this small work to your Lordship. If it fail of its main purpose, the fault, I am confident, is in the advocate, not in the cause: but, be this as it may, if it in any degree satisfy your Lordship, that the great favours which you have conferred on me, have been bestowed on a sincere and earnest, however humble, labourer in the ser-

vice of our Apostolic Church, the pains employed upon it will not have been thrown away.

Let me gratify myself my bearing this public testimony to that zeal and ardour in the cause of true religion, which even the lapse of more than twenty years beyond the ordinary age of man is unable to extinguish, and that watchful care for the welfare of your own Diocese, which it is my honour and my happiness every day to witness.

I am,

My Lord,

with the truest respect and gratitude,

Your Lordship's most dutiful

and most obliged Servant,

HENRY PHILLPOTTS.

May, 1825.

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

INTRODUCTION.—Reasons for the present publication.

—Title of Roman Catholics PAGE 1

LETTER II.

Authorities for Doctrines of the Roman Church.—

Devotion to the Virgin Mary and other Saints 17

LETTER III.

Relics.—Images.—The Cross 62

LETTER IV.

Dr. Lingard.—His unfaithfulness in quotation . 101

LETTER V.

Of Purgatory.—Doctrine of the Council of Trent.—

Trent Catechism.—Council of Florence.—Bellarmine.—Histories respecting Purgatory . . . 113

LETTER VI.

Mr. Butler's Statement of the means of relieving those who are detained in Purgatory.—His citation from Augustine on this subject.—Dr. Milner's citations from Augustine.—Mr. Butler's from Calvin . 132

LETTER VII.

Means of relieving those who are confined in Purgatory stated in the Decree and the Catechism of the Council of Trent 150

LETTER VIII.

Indulgences 158

LETTER IX.

Confession and Absolution in the Church of Rome.—Statement of Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England on these points 196

LETTER X.

On the supposed legal necessity of a Minister of the Church of England giving evidence in a Court of Justice of what has been confided to him in Confession 223

LETTER XI.

Augustine and Pelagius 229

LETTER XII.

Transubstantiation.—Real Presence as maintained by the Church of England.—Test Act.—Adoration of the Host 231

LETTER XIII.

Archbishop Wake.—Attacks of Dr. Milner on other English Prelates.—Mr. Butler's Charge on the Clergy of our Church 259

LETTER XIV.

The power of the Pope 271

LETTER XV.

Conclusion.—Revival of Jesuits and the Inquisition.

—Reasonable Fears of the Church of Ireland.—

Pastorini's Prophecies.—Parting Address to Mr.

Butler 308

Note to page 54. 329

 APPENDIX.

LETTER to the Right Hon. EARL GREY, occasioned by his Lordship's Speech in the House of Lords on moving the Second Reading of his Bill for abrogating the Declarations contained in the 25th and 30th of Charles II., commonly called "The Test against Popery." 331

22

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

TO

CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ.

LETTER I.

*Introduction.—Reasons for the present publication.—
Title of Roman-Catholics.*

SIR,

I HAVE read your “Book of the Roman-Catholic Church;” and in common, I conceive, with all your Readers, have been much gratified with the tone and temper in which it is written. If, in one or two instances, your zeal has made you, for a while, forget your charity, yet your politeness is always unimpaired; and you never appear to be more in your natural character, than in smoothing the asperities of controversy, and deprecating its violence. It has, indeed, been suggested by some of your Critics, that you have no objection to see your cause supported by others, in language which you would yourself be ashamed to use: and they appeal,

for the justice of this suspicion, to your ²strog recommendation of a work, from which every moderate person of every party turns with disgust, I mean “*Strictures on the Poet Laureate’s Book*,” written, as you tell us, by Dr. Milner.

I am not disposed to regard this matter so seriously; but look upon it rather as a very pardonable instance of the veneration you are accustomed to pay even to the foibles of an Apostolic Vicar. That dignitary, it seems, occasionally amuses himself with appearing in Masquerade; literally appearing,—for, though he wears a Masque, he writes upon it his own name, under the ingenious anagram of John *Merlin*: and, in the person of that old Deceiver, scruples not to indulge in certain licenses of language, which decorum would forbid him to adopt in his proper character. As, however, I have no inclination to join in his revels, I shall not waste time in descanting on them. But on another work of the same author, for my knowledge of the existence of which I am likewise indebted to your Book,—I mean the “*End of Controversy*,”—I shall have frequent occasion to remark in the course of these pages. Meanwhile, I hope I shall remember, during the whole of my address to you, that in courtesy at least, you have set an example, which it will

be discreditable to any, who may engage in the same controversy, to omit to imitate. Although, therefore, I may find it difficult, perhaps impossible, to say all that I think necessary on several of the topics of these letters, without in some degree wounding your feelings; yet I am desirous, in the outset, to assure you, that whatever I may think of your opinions, whatever I may be compelled to say of some parts of the statement of those opinions, I would not intentionally fail in any portion of that respect, which is due to you as a Scholar, a Gentleman, and, I would willingly hope, a sincere Christian.

To much the larger part of your Book, however, the historical matters on which you are at issue with Mr. Southey, I shall say nothing. That controversy is already in hands which will do it ample justice, nor will I weaken the effect of Mr. Southey's powerful eloquence in vindicating his own statements, by obtruding any feeble efforts of mine. The only purpose for which I have taken up my pen, is to say something on the *theological* part of your subject, especially on what is contained in your 10th Letter, entitled "View of the Roman-Catholic System."

I enter on this discussion, however, not with any intention of renewing the controversy on

the merits of our respective creeds; but merely to correct what appears to me to be a very erroneous statement, in some respects, of the doctrines of my own Church, but in a much greater degree of those of the Church of Rome. This is become the more necessary from the increasing prevalence, even in quarters where we might hope to find more accurate information, of an opinion, that the line, which separates the two Churches, is in fact much less strongly marked, than the prejudices and the passions of our Predecessors have taught us to believe.

That Members of your Communion should labour to encourage this notion, is not at all surprising. No mode of drawing Proselytes to the Roman-Church has been found so effectual, as that of persuading the incautious Protestant, that the change to which he is invited,—the departure from early convictions on the most important of all subjects,—is far less extensive, than he has been accustomed to regard it. You yourself, Sir, speak* of a “near approximation in our religious creeds.” And certainly this is at the present day a much less paradoxical position, than it would have been deemed a few generations ago. For in this protestant coun-

* Page 3.

try, many of the most revolting dogmas of Rome have been so much modified by collision with the tenets of the Reformed Church, so much reduced or palliated by the policy of your advocates, that the real state of religious opinion and practice among you here, is widely different from that which is exhibited in countries where similar causes do not operate, and where the Roman Creed has been permitted to produce its full effect.

Hence it will probably happen, that I shall be reproached with undertaking the ungracious office of reviving the memory of past differences, and seeking to exasperate the feelings of our contemporaries by an appeal to those grounds of discord, which are now, even by yourselves, tacitly abandoned. Such, however, is not the object of these pages. I am actuated, I hope, only by a wish to perform some part of the duty which I owe to that "pure and reformed part" of the Christian Church, of which I am a Minister. It surely cannot be necessary for a Clergyman of the Church of England to apologize, at any time, for bringing forward the real grounds, on which his Church found itself compelled to separate from the Church of Rome. This is not, be it remembered, nor can it ever be, one of those cases, in which silence and

compromise are consistent with good faith, and may therefore be demanded by charity. No! this, if any, is a vital question. For, if the differences between the two Churches be, indeed, as slight, as you and others would represent them, the plain consequence must be, (and you, at least, will not deny it,) that our separation from you was, and is, schismatical; that the Fathers and Martyrs of the Reformation were not only in error, but in sin; that they have propagated that sin to us their descendants; and that we cannot too soon retrace our steps, and sue to be re-admitted into the bosom of your Church.

It is plain, therefore, that the Ministers of the Church of England must not, and can not, permit it to be believed, that any approximation to the real doctrines of the Church of Rome is regarded by them as even possible. Be we, in charity, and mutual forbearance, as conciliating as you will:—too charitable, and too forbearing in things indifferent, we cannot be:—still we must not dissemble, that “between us and you there is a great gulph fixed;” which may indeed be passed from either side to the other,—but which admits not of any true resting-place being found between them.

But there is another reason, more peculiarly

belonging to the times in which we live, for this eagerness to represent the creeds of the two Churches as similar as possible;—I allude to the great political object, which engages all your hopes, and calls forth all the skill and ingenuity of your advocates. It is concluded, reasonably enough, that no better expedient, than this, can be adopted, to reconcile the minds of Englishmen to the removal of the remaining political restrictions under which you labour. Hence, again, a publication, like the present, issuing from the press at this particular period, will probably be attributed to the opposite wish of seeing those restrictions strengthened and perpetuated. But here, too, I think it proper to declare, that such is very far from being the motive of my present undertaking. Not that, if it were, I should feel it in any respect a discreditable motive, or one which would need to be defended. For, while so much is written, and said, on both sides of the question, what harm could there be in choosing this particular line of argument, be it convincing or otherwise, to vindicate the reasonableness and the justice of the existing Laws?

But such, I repeat, is not my purpose. If the time of this publication may seem to argue the contrary, let me remind you that this time

is not of my choosing, but of yours. At any period, and under any circumstances, I should have judged it right to expose so important a mis-statement, as I consider yours to be:—and I am not prevented from so doing by an apprehension, that I may be thought desirous of supporting one side of a great political question by the indirect influence of a theological argument. To say the truth, the connection of the political and theological questions does not appear to me so absolutely inseparable, as many wiser men than myself continue to regard it. But, at any rate, you, and those who act with you, have not a shadow of right to complain on this ground. You have sought to strengthen your political cause by mixing with it a statement of the theological dogmas of your Church. Now, let those dogmas be truly stated, (and the truth, when disputed, can only be ascertained by evidence and argument,) and then let their final bearing on the political question be that, and only that, which truth shall warrant.

But, whatever be the cause, the effect is notorious. It is become an usual topic in all popular discourses, written or spoken, on behalf of Roman-Catholics, in the journals of criticism (so called), and even in the speeches delivered in

parliament, to represent the creed and the discipline of the Church of Rome as nearly in accordance with those of the established church. The most signal instance of this kind was afforded in a debate in the House of Lords, on the 10th of June, 1819, on which occasion I presumed to address to the noble Earl, who led the debate, and distinguished himself by the theological arguments of his speech, a letter, which is now appended to these pages. In truth, some passages of your "Book," and of his Lordship's speech, have a remarkable resemblance, especially in their apparent reliance, for the accuracy of the principal statements contained in them, on the same reverend authority, that of Dr. Milner. His "End of Controversy" is the grand storehouse, from which a main portion of the facts and evidence, adduced both by yourself and by the noble Earl, appears to have been drawn; and a nice observer might, perhaps, without much difficulty, select some six pages of this work, in which all the theological learning displayed in that memorable debate would be found to be comprised.

In short, so much of management has been successfully employed to distort or disguise the truth, that it is no longer a superfluous task to revive in the members of our own church a re-

collection of the real nature of those tenets, from which our forefathers, at the Reformation, were enabled, by God's blessing, to rescue themselves and their descendants.

It is, Sir, with this purpose that I have undertaken to examine your "View of the Roman-Catholic System." But before I commence that examination, permit me to say a few words on the reason assigned by you for giving it this name. Mr. Southey, in the chapter to which your 10th Letter is an answer, had called it the *Papal* system. But you tell us that "the words "popery, papal, and papist" (the only names by which your religion, and those who profess it, were known to the law of the land till a very recent period) "being particularly offensive to "Roman-Catholics, you have altered the title "of Mr. Southey's chapter, by substituting "the word 'Roman-Catholic' for the word " 'Papal':—that in the oath which the legislature has prescribed to you, you are styled "Roman-Catholics:—and that on this account "it has always been a rule with you to denote, "in your publications, the religious denomination of Christians to which you belong, by "the appellation of Roman-Catholics."*

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 99.

To the wish implied in this alteration of yours I am very ready to accede. Indeed, in common with most, or all, of my Protestant brethren, I am accustomed, in the courtesy of private society, to give to persons of your communion the appellation which you suggest. You will pardon me, however, if I accompany my present adoption of it, before the public, with an explanation of the sense in which alone it ought, I conceive, always to be understood. The caution is not unnecessary; for our courtesy, in this particular, has been perverted into a standing argument against us. Among others, Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," thus avails himself of it. Speaking of "Catholicity" as his "third mark of the true church," "Is there not," says he, "among the rival churches, one exclusively known and distinguished by the name and title of THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, as well in England, Holland, and other countries which *protest* against this church, as in those which adhere to it? Does not this effulgent mark of the true religion so incontestably belong to us, in spite of every effort to obscure it by the nicknames of Papists, Romanists, &c., that the rule of St. Cyril and St. Augustin is as good and certain now as it was in their times? *What I mean is this* : if any stranger in London,

Edinburgh or Amsterdam, were to ask his way to the *Catholic Chapel*, I would risk my life for it, that no sober Protestant inhabitant would direct him to any other place of worship than to ours.”*

Before I refer to the main point contended for in this passage, I must notice, by the way, a little artifice of the reverend writer, in insinuating as the reason of our being called Protestants, that we “*protest* against the Catholic church.” Dr. Milner knows perfectly well that we owe that appellation to a very different cause:† he knows that neither we nor our predecessors ever “*protested* against the Catholic church,” nor even against that church which assumes to itself exclusively the title of Catholic. Against the latter, indeed, we have gone a good deal further than protesting. But this by the way.

On the main point here contended for by Dr. Milner, I answer by admitting the fact which he says “*he means*;” and I ascribe it, without hesitation, to the courtesy, the forbearance, and,

* End of Controversy, p. 192.

† The name of Protestants was adopted because of the *protestation* made by certain princes of the German Empire, who asserted the rights of religious liberty against the decree of the Diet of Spire, A.D. 1529.

in part, the carelessness, of Protestants, who unwilling to fight about a name have at length acquiesced in an assumption which ought, perhaps, to have been always strenuously resisted. I have already said that the law of the land gave you and your religion a very different name till the year 1791, when, for the first time, it called you Roman-Catholics. Nay, so little was your exclusive assumption of the title of Catholics then admitted, that you were afraid of so calling yourselves in your petition to parliament lest your petition should on that account be refused admission. You therefore were designated by your own committee as "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." Be this, however, as you will, your chapels may still, for ought I care, retain the name. But for the assertion, that your Church is in this country "exclusively known and distinguished by the name and title of THE CATHOLIC CHURCH," I can only admire the hardihood of the person who has thought fit to make it. I appeal to my protestant readers, whether they are in the habit of hearing the Roman church so distinguished by any of their Protestant brethren. That by protesting against "offensive appellations," deprecating the use of "nicknames," (as your more appropriate denominations are called by Dr. Milner and

others,) you have succeeded in obtaining for yourselves, ordinarily the title of Roman-Catholics, often that of Catholics simply, I admit, and for the unfair advantage taken of the concession I sincerely lament. But the abuse has not yet extended so far—we have not yet so utterly forgotten the creed which we every day recite,—as to give this title to your church; that is still, even in common parlance, the Church of Rome; and really, if Dr. Milner has any modesty, he ought to be somewhat more than content with such an appellation, given to it by Protestants; for he must be aware that, on our principles, it is much more manifest that yours is not *the Catholic church*, than it is easy to prove that you are, in any legitimate sense, a church at all. Many of the wisest and most pious Protestants have denied, in toto, your claim to that title; and the most that any of us can concede, is, that you are still a branch, though a most tremendously corrupt branch, of the Catholic church.

This is not a topic on which it is at all my wish to enlarge; but the boldness of the assumptions of Dr. Milner, and others of your writers, respecting “Catholicity,” as they are pleased to call it, and the want of clear notions on the subject, which too commonly prevails,

must be my excuse for stating some considerations, which to yourself, and to those who have ever studied the point, may justly appear trite and common-place.

Our judgment then of the Catholic Church is briefly this: That Catholic Church (as the name, you know, expresses) is the Universal Church, containing within it many particular Churches, even all congregations which retain "the faith once delivered to the saints," and contained in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. Every particular Church, which holds the fundamental points of that faith, and "in which the sacraments are duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all things necessary to the same,"* is a branch of the Catholic, or Universal Church. Even if it have introduced the most dangerous corruptions of doctrine and of worship, yet if it still hold the foundation, still agree in essentials, it is not wholly cut off. Those among us, who think, as at the present day most members of the Church of England rejoice to think, that the corruptions in your communion, grievous as they are, do not amount to a departure from the foundation, to an utter

* XIXth Article of the Church of England.

abandonment of essentials ; all such recognize your Church as still a part, though I am compelled to repeat, a most corrupt part, of the Catholic Church. The phrase, *Roman-Catholics*, therefore, may be tolerated, both as recognizing the distinction of particular branches, and as especially distinguishing members of the Roman branch of the Catholic Church ; just as *English-Catholics* might be a fit denomination, if it were necessary to adopt it, of members of the Church of England. Beyond this, courtesy itself must not induce us to go. We must protest against that sense of the phrase, which implies that they only are Catholics, who “ believe the Bishop of Rome to be the head “ of the Catholic Church, and that for that “ reason the Catholic Church may fitly be “ styled Roman-Catholic, being an universal “ body united under one visible head.”

LETTER II.

Authorities for Doctrines of the Roman Church.—Devotion to the Virgin Mary and other Saints.

FROM the title of your system, I proceed to the system itself.

But first, it is necessary to remark on what you say of the authorities on which you wish that the doctrines of your Church should be taken. You require that the following rule be rigidly observed: "That no doctrine should be ascribed to the Roman-Catholics as a body, except such as is an article of their faith;"* and you give the creed published by Pius IV. as "an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman-Catholic Faith."† Since, however, several of the articles of that creed are "expressed in general terms,"‡ you admit that it is necessary to look elsewhere for an explanation of the sense in which these articles are to be understood: and you particularly refer to the "Catechism of the Council of Trent," as an

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 9.

† Ib. p. 5.

‡ Ib. p. 8.

authoritative publication of your Church. You also mention some other works, which, however, cannot be received as of equal authority; such are Bossuet's "Exposition of Faith;" Mr. Gother's "Papist misrepresented and represented;" Dr. Chaloner's "Three short summaries of Catholic Faith and Doctrine," and his "Garden of the Soul."* But, above all, you recommend to us Dr. Milner's "End of Controversy," as "the ablest exposition of the doctrines of the Roman-Catholic Church, on the articles contested with her by Protestants; and the ablest statement of the proofs by which they are supported, and of the historical facts with which they are connected, that has appeared in our language."† This is high commendation, and will fully justify the particular attention I shall feel it my duty to pay to this writer in the sequel. But, meanwhile, I must object to all these works, except the Trent Catechism, as of insufficient authority, on which to pronounce what is the doctrine of the Church. That they contain your own particular creed, after the declaration made by you, cannot be doubted: we might look to them, therefore, with entire satisfaction, in any

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 10.

† Ib. p. 192.

enquiry respecting the religious tenets, for which you are individually answerable. But I need not remind you that our real question is respecting the doctrines speculative and practical, which are to be ascribed to your Church; such, in short, as may fairly be considered as making up its SYSTEM.

And here I must protest against being tied down to a consideration of those doctrines only, which are now delivered as articles of faith. These alone, it may be, are to be ascribed, as a matter of course, to you, and every one else who adheres to the communion of your Church; but the Church itself is answerable for all those doctrines, which having been promulgated by high authorities within it, by popes or councils, or writers under the immediate direction of such authorities, and having been long and extensively acted upon, are still undisclaimed, much more those which are still retained with favour at Rome. Let me not be misunderstood. I fully admit that, in general, a full and plain disclaimer of such doctrines by individuals may fairly be considered in relation to those individuals, the same as if the doctrines themselves had never been maintained. But they must, I contend, still be regarded as forming a part (though not equally with articles of faith

a prominent part) of the system of the Church of Rome, so long as they are cherished or retained at the seat of government, and by the highest authorities of that Church.

Still, it is my purpose, and I will not intentionally depart from it, to confine myself to such authorities, as cannot, I think, on any fair ground be objected to, and such as, I expect, you will not yourself venture to reject: the Boman Breviary, for instance, “restored according to the decree of the Council of Trent, “and published by command of Pius V.” possessing, therefore, exactly the same authority as the catechism of the same council, set forth by the same pope,—the acts of other general councils, the bulls of popes, and the works of writers, to whom you yourself, or your own admitted authorities, expressly refer. I shall also not scruple to cite one or two other authors of high reputation, not for the purpose of making your Church responsible for the tenets held by them, but as witnesses of the fact that certain tenets were held at the time they wrote.

Having premised thus much, I proceed to follow you in your own order.

The first particular, on which you undertake to state the doctrine of your Church, is “Devotion to the Virgin Mary, the Saints; re-

“ spect to the Cross, and to the Relics of the
“ Saints.”*

I shall beg leave to divide this particular into two, making the “devotion to the Virgin Mary
“ and the Saints,” the subject of my present letter, and reserving “the cross, relics, and images,” for that which will next follow.

On “devotion to the Virgin Mary and the
“ Saints,” you first give us a quotation from the council of Trent, and from the catechism published in pursuance of its decrees, and then cite other more popular works conformed to the same authorities.

The following is your statement of the doctrine of the council.

“ *The Saints*, reigning with Christ, offer up
“ their prayers to God for man. It is a good
“ and useful supplication to invoke them,”
(surely, Sir, this is not quite an adequate translation of *bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare*, it is good and useful *suppliantly to invoke them*,) “ and to have recourse† to their
“ prayers, help, and assistance, to obtain favour from God, through his son Jesus Christ
“ our Lord, above, who is our Redeemer and

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 100.

† Confugere.

“Saviour.”* “This,” you say, “is *the decree* of the council of Trent.”

Now from this the natural conclusion to be drawn (it has, in fact, been drawn†) is, that your Church gives to its members only a recommendation, not an express command, “suppliantly to invoke the Virgin and the Saints.” I can discover nothing more imperative in what you further say on this particular, for the Trent catechism is cited by you only to show that “God and the Saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner.” I must, therefore, consider you are stating this to be all for which your Church is here responsible: it *recommends* its members to make this invocation.

Dr. Milner, indeed, in his “End of Controversy,”‡ has been bold enough to affirm, that the “council of Trent *barely teaches* that it is “*good and profitable* to invoke the prayers of the Saints;” and he adds, “hence our divines infer, that there is no positive law of the Church, incumbent on all her children, to pray to the Saints.” Bossuet in like manner declares that “the council of Trent contents itself with teaching the faithful that this

* Sess. XXV. de Invocatione Sanctorum.

† Vid. infra.

‡ Page 252.

“ practice is *good and useful* to them, *without saying any thing more.*”*

It must be my business, therefore, to prove that your Church is responsible for a good deal more; and I will prove it from authorities acknowledged by yourself.

Now the very decree of the council of Trent from which you, and Dr. Milner, and Bossuet, have made the extract cited above, (which extract you are pleased to call *the Decree,*) say the very words, which immediately follow your quotation in the very same sentence, denounce as *impious* the denial of the position, “ that the saints enjoying eternal happiness in heaven are to be thus invoked.”† Is this barely teaching that the practice is good and profitable? Does this justify the inference that there is no positive law of the Church, incumbent on all her children to pray to the saints?

Again, the Creed of Pope Pius IV. to which you refer as “an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman-Catholic faith,”‡ and to which Dr. Milner has subscribed under the sanction

* Exposition of Faith, sect. V.

† Sess. XXV. “ Illos, qui negant sanctos, &c. invocandos esse, impiè sentire.”

‡ Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, 5.

of an Oath, declares expressly “ that the Saints
 “ reigning together with Christ, *venerandos atque*
 “ *invocandos esse.*” Is it still doubtful, whether
 your Church commands, or only recommends,
 the practice ?

Let us look then to the Trent Catechism,* to
 the question and answer immediately preceding
 that, from which you have favoured us with an
 extract. “ Q. Are the Saints also, reigning
 “ with Christ, to be invoked ?” “ A. In the
 “ second place we fly to the assistance of the
 “ Saints who are in heaven : *to whom also that*
 “ *prayers are to be made, is so certain in the*
 “ *Church of God, that to pious minds no doubt on*
 “ *the subject can occur, which thing, &c.*”

Again, in another† place the same Catechism
 tells us, “ with good reason the holy Church
 “ of God has added to this giving of thanks,
 “ prayers also and imploration addressed to
 “ the most holy Mother of God ; in order that
 “ we thus might piously and suppliantly have
 “ recourse to her to *reconcile God by her in-*
 “ *tercession to us sinners, and to obtain for us*
 “ *those good things which are necessary as well*

* Cat. Rom. p. 4. c. vi. q. 2. “ quibus etiam preces esse
 faciendas, ita certum est in Ecclesiâ Dei,” &c.

† Pars 4. c. 5. ad finem.

“ *for this life, as for life eternal.* Therefore we
“ exiled sons of Eve who inhabit this Vale of
“ Tears, *ought constantly to invoke* the mother of
“ mercy and advocate of the faithful, that she
“ may pray for us sinners, and by this prayer
“ we ought to implore help and assistance from
“ her, of whom no one without impiety and
“ nefarious wickedness can doubt, both her
“ pre-eminent merits with God, and her very
“ great willingness to assist mankind.”

Lastly in your Liturgies, your Missal, and other formularies, prayers to the Virgin and the Saints form a large portion. Is there “ no law of your Church incumbent on her children” to bear a part in these devotions ?

I think, Sir, that you will hardly venture to answer these enquiries in the negative. And, if you will not, how can you justify the statement you have made of the doctrine of your Church in this particular ?

But I proceed to examine what is meant by the *veneratio et invocatio*, which your Church enjoins to be paid to the Virgin and the Saints, especially to the former.

That they imply much more than your modern apologists are ready to admit, will soon be evident.—In the first place, it is the doctrine of

the council of Trent, that the Saints possess what we protestants are in the habit of considering as one of the distinguishing attributes of God,—I mean, a knowledge of what passes in the hearts of men. For the council includes *mental prayer* in the honour to be paid to saints: it pronounces all those to be guilty of impiety, who hold it foolish to address mental prayer to them, “illos, qui asserunt stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce vel *mente supplicare*, impiè sentire.”* But foolish would be a mild epithet for prayers addressed to those who are not privy to them.

Another attribute apparently ascribed to them, to some of them at least, especially the Virgin Mary, is omnipresence; or, if not simply omnipresence, presence throughout the habitable globe, and in every part of it at the same time. For, as all Christians are required to supplicate her, and it is difficult to conceive how she can receive their prayers without being present to them, I know not in what manner the consequence can fairly be avoided.

I am aware, indeed, that some ingenious expedients for this purpose have been suggested.

* Con. Trid. ib.

For instance, that God is pleased by immediate revelation to inform the Virgin and the Saints, of every supplication addressed to them ; and this seems to be the solution favoured by Dr. Milner.* But, as you tell us, that prayers are offered to the Saints, only that they may offer prayers to God on our behalf, it follows, that God first reveals to them what we entreat them to pray to him for us,—a process which is not very satisfactory to men of plain understanding. It is told of a great man who had the misfortune of writing very illegibly, that he was in the habit of accompanying every letter written by his own hand, with a Transcript of it by his Secretary, in order that he might at the same time testify his respect, and consult for the convenience of his correspondent. Now this, which is the very reverse of the supposed mode of availing ourselves of the assistance of the Saints in our prayers, seems to be much the more rational course of the two.

But another solution of the difficulty has been devised:—that the Saints have their information, not from God, but from the angels.

* End of Controversy, p. 250. “ It is sufficient for dissipating the Bishop of Durham’s phantom of Blasphemy, that *God is able to reveal* to the saints the prayers of Christians who address them here on earth.”

This, however, I fear, removes the difficulty but a single step. For whence have the Angels a knowledge of our prayers? What supports the Tortoise? Accordingly, a third plan has been thought of:—that the Saints see *in the mirror of the Deity* all that it is his pleasure they should see, and among other things, the prayers of their supplicants. A fourth mode of explaining the matter is, the supposition of an inconceivable celerity in the locomotion of Angels and Saints, a celerity, which, if it be sufficient for its purpose, is so near akin to ubiquity, that it leaves us where it found us.

I am not aware that any other expedient has ever been invented: and these, which I have recounted, are all the notions of individuals. As, therefore, on the one hand, your Church is not responsible for them; so neither perhaps, on the other, can it claim for its doctrine the benefit of any assistance which any of them may be supposed to yield. That doctrine, I repeat, proposed as it is by the Council in all its nakedness, seems to ordinary understandings to involve the ascription of the divine attributes of *knowledge of the hearts of men*, and of *omnipresence*, to the Saints. And this, I conceive, cannot but tend largely to augment the devotion of their votaries towards them.

But there are some other considerations to be taken into the account. Your Church is in the habit of dedicating sacred buildings to the Saints, not merely as a designation of those buildings, and to distinguish them from others, but strictly and formally to make them belong to those by whose name they are called. Hence the title of Basilicæ,* royal residences. For while they are Churches of God, they are also the palaces of St. Peter, St. Paul, or others, because those Saints occupy them by their relics, which are therein deposited.† To these buildings very important spiritual privileges are annexed, in order to increase the honour of those to whom they are dedicated. For, pilgrimages to them, and the performance of divine worship in them, are rewarded with peculiar and very great advantages. But of this we shall have occasion to speak more particularly hereafter, under the head of indulgences; at present it is mentioned, only as an ingredient in the religious honour paid by the Church of Rome to Saints, and that too, under the express sanction of a decree of the council of Trent.‡

* The inscription on the front of St. Peter's, which bears the name of Paul V. is "In honorem principis apostolorum."

† Bellar. de Cult. Sanct. lib. iii. c. 4.

‡ Sess. xxv.

Another not unimportant particular, is that of *Vows* commonly addressed to Saints : and here I must beg your patience, while I dwell a little on this part of our subject. The greatest of your controversial divines, Bellarmine,* has judged it necessary to do so, which will be a sufficient excuse for me.

He says that “ all the Heretics consider us “ as Idolaters, on account of the Vows, which “ are *every where* made to Saints. And the “ reason may be,” he adds, “ *because a Vow is an “ act of religion due to God alone, as appears from “ divine Scripture, where always Vows are said to “ be made to God. Nevertheless, that they may “ in some manner be made to Saints, is most cer- “ tain :*” and to the establishment of this proposition, he then proceeds. After citing the authority of Fathers, he quotes the answer of St. Thomas to the argument against Vows to Saints, suggested above. This answer is as follows—“ That Vows made to Saints include “ two promises, one to the Saint,—and that is not “ formally a Vow, but the matter of a Vow ; and “ the other to God,—and this is formally the Vow ; “ as, for instance, when a man says ‘ I Vow to “ the blessed Mary that I will make a pilgrimage

* De Cult. Sanct. lib. iii. c. 9.

“ ‘ to her house,’ he promises to the Virgin this pilgrimage, but this promise is not a Vow ;
“ and at the same time promises to God, that
“ he will fulfil his promise made to the Virgin ;
“ and this second promise is truly the Vow.”

But this answer, Bellarmine admits, is insufficient. It will do very well, says he, in the case of vows made to living men, such as vowing obedience to a prelate, for this is in fact a Vow to God, the intention of it being to honour not the prelate but God. “ But,” continues Bellarmine, “ he who vows to the Saints a fast
“ or a pilgrimage, *intends thereby to pay a religious honour to the saints themselves.*” Besides, says he, it has been proved against that article of St. Thomas, from the very profession of the Fratres Prædicatores, that vows are truly made to the saints ; for they say, in making their profession, “ *I vow to God, and to the blessed Mary, and to all the saints,* that I will be obedient
“ to such or such a prelate,” where of the two promises, included in the words, that, which is formally the vow is directed to God and the saints together.

Another solution, therefore, has been adduced, namely, that vows are made to saints not as they are certain creatures endowed with reason, but, *as in them God dwelleth by Glory* ; so that

the vows made to saints are made to God in saints, in the same manner as maledictions against saints are blasphemous, because God is blasphemed in them.

This solution is accepted by Bellarmine, who says, however, that vows are not made to God, and to saints, exactly after the same sort, and therefore that vows to the latter are not idolatrous: for it is universally agreed among Catholics, that a thing is promised to God, in testimony of our gratitude to him as the first cause of all good, and in acknowledgment of blessings received from himself, but to saints, in testimony of our gratitude to them, as our mediators and intercessors, through whom we have received blessings from God.

There remains one objection for him to answer, which he thus states; "If a promise made to dead saints may be called a vow; why not also a promise to saints still living with us?" His answer is as follows; because, first, a promise made to saints reigning with Christ is more like a promise made to God, than one which is made to a living man; inasmuch as the thing promised is not useful to the saints in Heaven, but to ourselves, and is only offered in testimony of our veneration and gratitude; secondly, because a vow is not suitable to

sancti
 stains, unless as *they are Gods by participation*,* and we know for certain that saints reigning with Christ are really such; besides, they are confirmed in that state and cannot fall from it. In both which respects they differ from living saints.

I have dwelt with Bellarmine at some length on this particular, at the risk of being tedious; because I think it throws much light on the kind of honour paid by members of your Church to saints. For, whether your church be, or be not, answerable for Bellarmine's arguments, he at least must be admitted as a sufficient evidence of facts, namely, of the general prevalence of the practice of offering vows to saints, and of the general notion of the nature of them entertained by your highest authorities. That the multitude in his day regarded them still more seriously, and offered them with the utmost degree of religious confidence, and on the most ordinary and trivial occasions, is plain from the testimony of his contemporary Erasmus, a testimony which he cites himself, without affecting to contradict it, I mean the dia-

* *Votum non convenit Sanctis, nisi quatenus sunt Dii per participationem; at Sanctos, cum Deo regnantes, certè scimus esse tales.* Bell. *ibid.*

logue entitled “Naufragium,” a rich treat to those who have never read it.

For the prevalence, and the kind of vows, offered to saints in these days, I venture to refer to any modern traveller in Spain or Italy.

I admit, that I am not aware of any positive order of your Church for this particular species of honour to saints; but it will hardly be contended that it is not, as a Church, answerable for a practice so ancient, so general, so strongly asserted and enforced by its greatest divines, and never in any way restrained.

And here I should proceed to prayers addressed by your Church to saints; but there is one previous question, (a very simple one it is true,) which requires to be first stated. As you are in the habit of addressing a good many saints, the merits of very few of whom are mentioned in Scripture, a plain man might ask, —What assurance you have that they really are Saints? Is it not possible that very awkward mistakes may occasionally happen? That you may, for instance, address your petitions to persons of very different characters, and occupying a very different place in the world of Spirits, from that which you suppose? And this uncertainty, if it be not removed, must considerably impair the zeal of all rational worshippers.

The possibility of all this is so manifest, that you have very long been provided with a remedy. It is true, that for some centuries matters went on rather uncertainly, and during that time very unpleasant accidents did sometimes occur. Pope Alexander III. had occasion to reprehend certain persons for worshipping, as a martyr to the cause of true religion, a man who was in truth only a martyr to the strength of his wine, having been killed in a state of drunkenness.* And Bellarmine informs us, on the authority of Sulpicius, of the following remarkable occurrence which happened to St. Martin.† He had long entertained some pretty strong doubts of the propriety of the devotions offered by the people in his neighbourhood to a supposed saint; because, in truth, there was nothing very certain or satisfactory in the traditions concerning him. One day, when St. Martin was at his prayers, the ghost of this personage appeared to him, and frankly confessed “that *he was a damned spirit*; that when “alive he had been a robber; and that he had “suffered death for his crimes by the hand of “the public executioner.”

To prevent the recurrence of similar mistakes,

* Bell. de Cult. Sanct., l. i. c. 7.

† Ibid.

a solemn process, under the especial cognizance of the Pope, has long been instituted, by which the pretensions of any deceased persons, for whom the honour of Sainthood is demanded, are strictly examined; particularly the sufficiency of the miracles alleged to have been wrought by him; for the working of miracles is always held to be an indispensable qualification. In this process all imaginable precautions are taken; the lapse of at least a hundred years after the death of the saints is, if I mistake not, patiently expected, whether to collect evidence, to preclude partiality, or to remove prejudices. A devil's advocate, as I believe he is called, is assigned for the purpose of suggesting every objection, and enforcing every reasonable doubt;—the inquest “proceeds,” you tell us, “through several stages, until it is ascertained, by the most solemn and strict proofs, that the party possessed the virtues of faith, hope, and charity, in an eminent, or,—to use the language of the proceeding,—in an heroic degree; and that miracles were worked by him, or through his intercession.”* If, with all this care, a

* “Book of the Roman-Catholic Church,” p. 280.

decree of the Pope be not infallible,* it is hard indeed.

The effect of a favourable sentence, under such circumstances, cannot fail to be that of giving confidence to the pious worshipper, and increasing the intensity of his devotion. Bulls of canonization do not often fall in our way; but from one which I have met with in favour of a countryman of our own, St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who is justly the object of your very high praise, I find that Pope Alexander enjoins and commands all the faithful to worship, venerate, and *adore*, all who are admitted into the number of saints.†

But I shall now proceed to a more particular enquiry into the sort of honour prescribed by your Church to be paid to them, especially in the case of the Virgin Mary. Let us see then, first, what is the notion of your Church respecting the personal dignity of the Virgin, and secondly, what are the devotions actually addressed to her. In following this course, I shall confine myself rigidly to authorities which you cannot reject: I will not make

* Bell. de Sanct. Beatit. lib. i, cap. 9. says that Catholics declare it to be certain, that the Church does not err in the canonization of saints.

† Labbe, Concil. t. xiii, p. 1474.

use of any Breviary or Missal, but those which were reformed, and set forth according to the decree of the Council of Trent.

Now, in the reformed Breviary, your Church has thought proper to proclaim, that *the birth of the Virgin was supernatural*,* and to institute a festival in honour of her conception by her Mother Anna. Whether this conception was *immaculate*, so that she should in this respect be held equal to her blessed Son, as having been born without any taint of original sin, is well known to have been the subject of a long and obstinate contention between two of your greatest religious orders; the Franciscans, following the opinion of Duns Scotus, strenuously maintaining the affirmative, which was as strenuously denied by St. Thomas and the Dominicans. The former, however, was the more general opinion; and a festival, I repeat, was appointed in honour of her conception, for which, unless on account of its having been immaculate, it is not very easy to assign any sufficient reason.†

* Vid. Breviar. die xxi. Nov. In festo præsentationis B. M.

† Bellarmine, afraid to pronounce that the Church positively affirms the doctrine of the immaculate Conception, and yet feeling the awkwardness of having the festival without the acknowledgment of the immaculacy of the Conception, says (De

Festival see 8 - 1st appointed 1389
 opposition did not till Paul V. 1617 -
 Gregory XV. & Alexander VII - see 8 18
 15 a B-11 declare

Sixtus IV., in the bulls by which he institutes a particular office for this festival, and gives indulgence to those who celebrate it, seems to recognize the immaculacy of the conception; though he speaks of it as a point *not yet* decided by the Church.* The Council of Trent not only adopts and confirms the bulls of Sixtus, but also expressly declares, that *it does not comprehend the Virgin Mary in its decree respecting original sin*,† namely, that *all mankind* are infected with it by propagation from Adam. It is true, that by forbearing to say in terms, that the Virgin was free from original sin, the Coun-

Cult. Sanct. lib. iii, c. 16,) that “the *Conception* was ‘some how ‘or other sacred,’ (aliquo modo sanctam) because there is a festival in its honour.”

* In the first of these bulls, (which are printed with the Acts of the Council of Trent, having been particularly confirmed and adopted by the council,) Sixtus speaks thus: “dignum, quin potius *debitum*, reputamus, universos Christi fideles, ut *omnipotenti Deo de ipsius immaculatæ Virginis mirâ conceptione gratias et laudes referant invitare.*” In the other bull, he uses the expression “*ejusdem immaculatæ conceptionis* :” in this latter bull, while he pours forth all sorts of vehement denunciations against those who speak of the belief of the article as heretical, condemning such speeches as “false, erroneous, and utterly foreign from the truth,” he censures the other party for uttering similar charges of heresy against their adversaries, merely “because the point has not yet been decided by the Church.”

† Sess. v.

cil left a small loophole for the Dominicans; and thus while Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, in his treatise against Luther, written before the Council, had treated it as a matter beyond all question, that the Virgin was “*devoid of all taint as well of original as of actual sin;*”* Bellarmine, who wrote subsequently, was content to say, that “it is quite certain, and the universal opinion of the Church, affirmed by the Council of Trent, that she was free from actual sin, and it is pious to think that she was also free from original sin.” The Council, in the canon to which Bellarmine refers, goes so far as to declare, that “by the special privilege of God the blessed Virgin was, during her whole life, able to avoid all, even venial, sins.”†

In accordance with this doctrine of the Council, she is spoken of in the Roman Breviary as having “a conscience absolutely devoid of sin,”‡ and, again, as “stained by no earthly affections.”§ From this resemblance to her divine Son, in being “without sin,” the transition becomes more easy to other points of resem-

* Adv. Luther. art. xvii. p. 490.

† Sess. vi. c. 23.

‡ In Oct. Assumpt. B. M.

§ In Assumpt. B. M.

blance, at least, if not of equality. Accordingly, she is coupled with our Lord in the great work of man's salvation, in a way which can scarcely fail to lead the unwary to ascribe as much, or nearly as much, of that blessed work to her, as to our Lord himself. Not to multiply instances, the following is the opening of a lesson in the "Officium B. Mariæ in Sabbato," (Mense Junio,) "Grievously, my beloved, were we hurt by "one man and one woman (Adam and Eve); "but thanks be to God, *not less by one man and "one woman** are all things restored, aye and "with great usury of grace; for not as was "the offence, so also is the free gift, &c."

Festivals to her honour are as frequent, as to the honour of Christ himself. Besides the festival of her Conception, there is one of her Nativity, another of her Presentation by her parents in the Temple, and another of her Assumption into Heaven. A similarity indeed between her and our blessed Lord is studiously affected. Not only is the assumption of her body into Heaven made to parallel our Lord's

* "Daughter of the eternal Father! Mother of the eternal Son! and Spouse of the Holy Ghost!" is an address to her in the Devout Communicant, p. 66. one of the prayer-books commonly used in England.

Saint have been taken up to heaven

45 - 75 -

1st

ascension, but that body itself is stated, like our Lord's, to have been miraculously preserved from corruption. On the 4th day of the week after the Assumption, (for a whole week is devoted to the honour of that event,) a lesson is read, in which it is declared that "at the time of her glorious falling asleep" (her death,) "all the Apostles, who were employed in their holy mission through the whole earth, for the salvation of mankind, were in a moment carried aloft through the air, and brought together to Jerusalem:—while they were there, they saw a vision of Angels, and heard the hymns of the Hosts of Heaven, and *so with divine glory she delivered her Soul into the hands of God.* But her body was taken amidst the songs of Angels and of the Apostles, and deposited in a coffin at Gethsemane, in which place the melody of Angels continued for three days. At the end of those days, the Apostles opened the tomb, to enable Thomas, who alone had hitherto been absent, to fulfil a wish which he felt, *to adore that body, which had borne the Lord.* On opening it, the body was no where to be found, but only the grave-clothes in which it had been wrapped; and from them issued an ineffable odour, pervading the atmosphere around. So wonder-

“ful and mysterious an event astonished the
“Apostles, who could draw from it but one
“conclusion, that it had pleased the Word of
“God, that her immaculate body (by which
“he was incarnate) should be preserved from
“corruption, and should be at once translated
“to Heaven, without waiting for the general
“resurrection of all flesh.”

In the service of the next day is the following lesson. “But who is sufficient to conceive,
“how glorious on this day was the progress of
“*the Queen of the World!* with what transport
“of devout affection the whole multitude of
“the Heavenly Hosts went forth to meet her!
“with what hymns she was conducted to the
“throne of glory! with how placid, how serene
“an aspect! with what divine embraces she
“was received by her Son, and *exalted above*
“*every creature*,—with that honour which be-
“came the worth of so great a Mother, and
“that glory which befitted so great a Son!”

The Title, here bestowed on her, of “Queen
“of the World,” is not the highest which she
has received. In the Bull of Sixtus, adopted,
I repeat, by the Council of Trent, she is styled
“Queen of the Heavens,” and her Son is spoken
of in the same sentence as “King.” Indeed in

one of your popular Prayer-Books, now in use in this country, (to which therefore you refer us,) she is thus addressed, "O glorious Queen of Heaven."* This same title "Queen of Heaven" is given to her in the Breviary:† where she is also called "Domina omnium creaturarum," able, therefore, we may presume, to dispense to her worshippers any blessing they can need or ask.

On the fifth day of the week of her Nativity occurs the following:—"Truly a great miracle, my beloved brethren, was the ever blessed Virgin Mary. For what in any past time was ever found, or what in time to come will it be possible to find, greater or more illustrious than she? She alone has surpassed Heaven and Earth in her greatness. For what is more holy than she? Neither Prophets, nor Apostles, nor Martyrs, nor Patriarchs, nor Angels, nor Thrones, nor Powers, nor Seraphim, nor Cherubim, nor aught beside of created things, visible, or invisible, can be found greater or more excellent. She is at once the handmaid and the mother of God, a Virgin and a Mother."

* The Devout Communicant, p. 29.

† Off. B. Mariæ, tempore Paschali.

At the hazard of being tedious, I must insert the following lesson taken from an exposition on 1 Sam. i. 1. “Now there was a certain Man of Ramathaim-zophim, of Mount Ephraim.”

“The most blessed, ever-virgin Mary, Mother of God, may be designated by the name of the Mountain. For she was indeed a Mountain, who by the dignity of her election transcended every exaltation of every elect creature. Was not Mary a sublime Mountain, who, that she might attain to the conception of the eternal Word, *reared the summit of her merits above all the choirs of Angels, even to the throne of the Godhead?* For *this is the Mountain, of whose surpassing dignity Isaiah prophesies.* ‘It shall come to pass in the last days, that the Mountain of the Lord’s House shall be established in the top of the Mountains.’ For a Mountain she was in the top of the Mountains; because the exalted height of Mary shone resplendent above all Saints:”*

And an extract from a lesson on Rev. xii. 1. “And there appeared a great wonder in Heaven, a Woman clothed with the Sun,” &c.

* Off. B. M. Mense Augusto.

“ Let us embrace the footsteps of Mary, my
“ brethren, and with the devoutest supplication
“ let us fling ourselves before her blessed feet.
“ Let us hold her fast; let us not suffer her to
“ go, till she hath blessed us; for she is power-
“ ful. She is ‘ the Fleece of Wool between
“ ‘ the dew and the threshing-floor’ (Judges vi.
“ 37); but perhaps your wonder is rather given
“ to (her other symbol) ‘ the Woman clothed
“ ‘ with the Sun.’ For great indeed is this
“ connexion, wonderful is the nearness of the
“ Sun and the Woman. How is it, that in
“ so intense a fire, so frail a nature subsists?
“ Verily, with reason, thou, O holy Moses,
“ wonderest and longest with curious eye to
“ look into it. But ‘ put thy shoes from off
“ ‘ thy feet,’ and cast a vail over thy fleshly
“ cogitations, if thou desirest to draw nigh.”

But to Protestant ears the most offensive instance of profaneness is the repeated, the constant application to her of verses of the 24th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, which were meant to refer to the divine Wisdom; particularly the 9th and 10th verses:—“ He created me from
“ the beginning, before the world, and I shall
“ never fail: in the holy tabernacle I ministered before him;”—and again,* though more

* Missal. in Nativ. B. M. V. et in Concept. B. M. V.

rarely, of the 8th chapter of Proverbs, from the 22d to the 35th verses, a passage often used to prove the eternal generation of the Son of God:—"The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was: &c. &c. Hear instruction, and be wise, and refuse it not. Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors: for whoso findeth me, findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord."

In some degree of accordance with these representations of her dignity are the hymns and prayers addressed to her.

" Mary, mother of grace,
 " Mother of mercy,
 " Do thou protect us from the enemy,
 " And at the hour of death take us to thyself."*
 " Loose the bonds of the guilty,
 " Hold forth light to the blind,

* In Off. parv. B. M.

Maria Mater Gratiae
 Mater Misericordiae
 Tu nos ab hoste protege
 Et horâ mortis suscipe.

“ Drive all evil from us,
 “ Ask all good things for us.
 “ *Shew thyself to be a Mother,*
 “ *Let him through thee* receive our prayers,
 “ Who for our sakes submitted
 “ To be born thy son.”*

It is worth remarking that, in this latter instance, an important change has been wrought in transferring the original hymn into your English book of devotion, in order to accommodate it to the feelings of those who live among Protestants. The turn given to it in the “Garden of the soul,” p. 254, is as follows,

“ Exert the Mother’s care,
 “ And *us thy children own,*
 “ To him convey our prayer,
 “ Who chose to be thy Son;”

thus ingeniously avoiding the awkward request implied in the original, that she will exercise

* In Off. B. M. et passim—

Solve vincla reis,
 Profer lumen cæcis,
 Mala nostra pelle,
 Bona cuncta posce.
Monstra te esse Matrem,
Sumat per te preces,
 Qui pro nobis natus,
 Tulit esse tuus.

the influence of a Mother over her blessed Son, and so secure his acceptance of our prayers.

But all this, it will be said, is poetry; and the language of poetry, even in hymns, is not to be taken literally. Let us see, then, in one or two brief instances, what is the tone of your prayers in prose.

“Vouchsafe to allow me to praise thee, O Sacred Virgin: give me strength against thy enemies.”*

“To thy protection we fly, O holy mother of God. Despise not our prayers in the time of our necessities; but from all dangers always deliver us, O Virgin glorious and blessed.”†

It is perfectly true, that in general she is addressed to help her worshippers by *her intercession*; but this is accompanied by such acknowledgment of the efficacy of her intercession, as seems but little suitable to any mediator less than divine. Such is the following: “Admit our prayers within the sanctuary of hearing, and bring back to us the antidote of reconciliation.” “*Through thee*, may that be pardonable which through thee we urge: may that be able to be obtained, which with a

* Off. parv. B. Mariæ.

† Off. parv. B. Mariæ.

“ faithful mind we pray ; Because *thou art the*
 “ *only hope of sinners.* Through thee we hope*
 “ *for pardon of our offences, and in thee, O most*
 “ *blessed, is the expectation of our rewards.* Holy
 “ Mary, succour the miserable, assist the hum-
 “ ble-minded, cherish the afflicted, pray for
 “ the people, interpose for the clergy, intercede
 “ for the devout women : Let all feel thy help
 “ who celebrate thy nativity.”

And now permit me to ask you, Sir, whether you think that the Church which has prescribed such services, as I have here quoted, in its authorized liturgy, its most formal book of public devotion, is indeed so innocent as you have represented ? Can it be truly averred, that “ from saying to God ‘ Have mercy on us,’ the “ descent is infinite † to addresses such as these “ to the Virgin Mary ?” Will you press for an answer to your questions, “ Whether the au- “ thorities which you have cited do not give “ a true and clear exposition of the doctrine of “ your Church upon this important subject ? “ Whether the doctrine be idolatrous or super-

* Tu es spes unica peccatorum. Per te speramus delictorum veniam ; et in te, beatissima, nostrorum est expectatio præmiorum, &c.—Sect. v. & vi. in Die ix Septembris, 2da infra Oct. Nativ. B. M. V.

† Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 101.

“ stitious ? *Whether the practice of it do not fill the mind with soothing reflections ?* with thoughts that increase charity, and animate piety ? ” *

What may be your thoughts under the practice of such devotions, it is not for me to conjecture. If “ the hours thus spent by you ” be, as you intimate, “ among the most pleasing of your life,” may He, who alone knows, and who will mercifully allow for, all that is in man, the strength of early prejudice and long-confirmed habit, and above all, the weakness of our poor reason to resist them—may He extend to you on that day when we all shall need it, the full benefit of that His most merciful allowance !

But you insinuate that “ several distinguished divines of our own Church maintain the same doctrine.” † I defy you to name a single one : and if you are unable to do so, is it worthy of your character, or consistent with ordinary candour, to hazard so wild a suggestion ? You name indeed one, Doctor Thorndyke, not as holding the doctrine of your Church on this subject, (that would be too bold,) but as acquitting it of the charge of idolatry.

Dr. Milner ‡ has also availed himself of the

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 102.

† Id. ib.

‡ End of Controversy, p. 252.

same passage from Thorndyke, which you quote, and has been pleased to give that author a very appropriate praise; he calls him repeatedly, "the candid Prebendary of Westminster."

To shew you that he has well merited that title, I will give you two passages from different books of his, that which you quote not having fallen in my way.* The first shall be from his largest and most important work, entitled "An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England," published in 1659. In the 3d book, p. 357, 358, speaking of those prayers in your Church, which are addressed to the saints, desiring of them the same blessings, spiritual and temporal, which all Christians desire of God, in which class, I conceive, must be numbered most of those cited by me from the Roman Breviary, he has these words: "Taking
 " them at the foot of the letter, and valuing
 " the intent of those that use them, by nothing
 " but the words of them, they are mere idolatries. And were we bound to make the acts
 " of them that teach these prayers the acts of
 " the Church, because it tolerates them, and

* Since these papers have been sent to the press, I have seen a copy of Thorndyke's "Just Weights and Measures," and I find your citation from it correct.

“ maintains them in it, instead of casting them
“ out, it would be hard to free that Church from
“ idolatrie.” “ But the words of these are
“ capable of the same limitation, that I gave
“ to the words of our Lord, when I said, that
“ they whom Christians do good to here, may
“ be said to receive them into everlasting habi-
“ tation, because God does it in consideration
“ of them, &c. &c.”

I will add an extract from another tract
of Thorndyke's, expressly entitled “ Judgment
“ of the Church of Rome.” The 12th head of
which is as follows: “ To pray to saints de-
“ parted for those things which only God can
“ give (*as all Papists do*) is, by the proper sense
“ of their words, downright idolatry. If they
“ say their meaning is by a figure only to desire
“ them to procure their requests of God: *How*
“ *dare any Christian trust his soul with that*
“ *Church, which teaches that which must needs be*
“ *idolatry in all that understand not the figure?*”

And now, Sir, I willingly leave to you and
Dr. Milner all the advantage you can derive
from the admission of this “ candid Prebendary
“ of Westminster.”

But you claim the further authority of “ se-
“ veral of the most eminent Protestant Divines,”
of “ several of the brightest lights of the esta-

“blished Church,” such as “Archbishop Sheldon, and the Bishops Blandford, Gunning, Montague, &c.”*

Of the names of these Bishops, whom you thus highly extol, two, Sheldon and Blandford, are utterly unknown to Protestants as theological authorities; of the others I will only say, that, eminent as they were in their respective generations, their merits have not been such as to secure to them much attention from posterity. But be they as illustrious as you choose, I undertake to shew, that not one of them is a witness in your favour.

Of Archbishop Sheldon and Bishop Gunning enough has been said in my letter to Earl Grey,† to which I beg leave to refer you. Of Bishop Blandford’s opinion the only alleged evidence is a hearsay of the Duchess of York, a convert to her husband’s religion; contained in a letter of hers, which, I believe, (for I have not been able to procure it,) first appeared several years after the death both of the Duchess and of the Bishop. And if evidence of this kind is worth attention, I will undertake to prove that there is scarcely any opinion however blasphemous or

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 327.

† See below.

immoral, which has not been maintained by Prelates of your Church.

The only one that remains is Bishop Montague; of him you say as follows—"Bishop Montague in particular owns, that 'the
" 'blessed in heaven do commend to God, in
" 'their prayers, their kindred, friends, and
" 'acquaintance on earth.'" " 'This,' saith the
" learned prelate, 'is the common voice with
" 'the general concurrence, without contra-
" 'diction, of reverend and learned antiquity,
" 'for aught I ever could read or understand;
" 'and I see no cause or reason to dissent from
" 'them touching intercession in this kind.'"*

Now, Sir, on this passage, permit me, first, to ask, by what process of the understanding you arrive at the conclusion you draw from it. "Bishop Mountagu says, that the saints in heaven pray for men to God; therefore, he holds it to be not idolatry for men on earth to pray to the saints in heaven." Was there ever such a syllogism?

But I will not waste time in arguing against the logic of the case. I have a more disagreeable duty to discharge, I have to expose its dishonesty. The truth is, that the citation

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 328.

itself (which you have been duped by some old controversialist to adopt) is a gross, an abominable fraud,—a fraud the more abominable, because the work* on which it is practised, lies out of the reach of ordinary readers, and detection therefore is rendered difficult.

A copy of that work is now before me, and I find on examining it, first, that *the sentences cited by you have been transposed*; that the one, attesting the assent of the ancients, does not attest their assent to what you have stated. Next I find, that *the real scope of the passage is the very contrary to what you insinuate*. I will give you the Bishop's own words; and I am sorry to be obliged to do this at some length.

“Charitie,” says he, “is transcendent in
“these celestiaall citizens; and therefore no
“question, they pray for men on earth. But
“how? and for whom? *All Christians in gene-
“rall; their brethren as yet in great tribula-
“tion, the Church militant upon the face of
“the earth. This they know; the state of these,
“and their necessities are known to them in hea-
“ven: and upon knowledge they doe commiserate
“them, and commiseration procureth interces-
“sion, else were there no communion of saints,*

* “Invocation of Saints,” by Bishop Montagu.

“no bond betwixt the militant and triumphant Church. In specie, for those Churches, whereof themselves were parts, noble and lively members, yet being in the flesh, as more interested there than otherwere.” But so for those, ordinarily and of common course, as that which they pray for is *the general good of all, not the particular interest of any one.*” He then cites an instance from Gregory Nazianzene, and adds, “*This is the common voice with generall concurrence, without contradiction, of reverend and learned antiquitie, &c.*”

The author next carries the matter one step farther, and says expressly of himself, what you make him allege has the universal assent of antiquity; but he says even this in a sense the very contrary to that which you would have it to bear: for he says it with limitations, which the writer, whom you follow, fraudulently suppresses; but which *imply the impossibility of the Saints in Heaven being at all moved by, or even privy to, the prayers addressed to them by men on Earth.* The following are the Bishop’s words.

“I adde in particular” (that is, of my own mind, not from the general concurrence of antiquity) “yet somewhat farther. Those with God may and doe recommend unto God in

“ their celestiall prayers, their kindred, friends,
 “ and acquaintance upon Earth, *whom they*
 “ *knew, in whose love and familiaritie they had*
 “ *interest yet being in the flesh,* and with whom
 “ they had conversed more reservedly. But
 “ no sort and manner for *them*, then only for
 “ such instant and exigent necessities; *For such*
 “ *causes, occasions, and employments, as being yet*
 “ *in vivis, and conversant with them, they knew of,*
 “ understood, and were acquainted withall or
 “ interested in, and *have not forgotten being re-*
 “ *sidents in those heavenly habitations,* and all
 “ teares wiped away from their own eyes.”

Dr. Milner* has conducted this part of the case somewhat more astutely, and with less offence against the laws of logic. He has not fallen into your palpable ignoratio elenchi; but he too has had recourse to an expedient, which, I am confident, it would give you more pain to adopt, than to be called for once a bad logician. Dr. Milner quotes part of a sentence from the same treatise of Bishop Mountagu, in proof of his assertion, that he had “ *altogether*
 “ *abandoned the charge of Idolatry against Roman-*
 “ Catholics on this head;” “ I own Christ is
 “ not wronged in his mediation. It is no im-

* End of Controversy, p. 252.

“ piety to say, as they do : Holy Mary, pray
 “ for me : Holy Peter, pray for me.”*

I have already said (what Dr. Milner has not said) that this is *part* of a sentence. I will now proceed to give the whole of it, in order that our readers may see with what fairness this part has been brought forward as a proof that the Author *altogether abandoned the charge of Idolatry*. “ I grant,” says he, “ Christ is not
 “ wronged in his mediation. It is no impiety
 “ to say as they doe, Sancta Maria, ora pro me :
 “ Sancte Peter, ora pro me, and so no wrong
 “ unto Christ Jesus, to use mediation of inter-
 “ cession unto him. As it is taught, I adde in
 “ their schooles : by their Doctors : resolved by
 “ that oracle of Trent. But *not as is practised*
 “ *in their use and custome, where simple men in-*
 “ *voked Saints as they doe God : go to their devo-*
 “ *tions unto the blessed Virgin, not only far more*
 “ *frequently than to Christ Jesus : but without any*
 “ *difference at all goe to it downe right, as to the*
 “ *Authors and originals of the things they desire,*
 “ *having them in their power to bestow or not.*”
 Then, after allowing that the Saints in Heaven have greater power than on Earth, “ not to give
 “ but to intreate,” he refers to the former part of

* Invocation of Saints, p. 118.

his subject in these words, “ But *admit it not impietie*, as I think it is not, *it is flat and egregious foolerie at the best.*”

The truth is, Sir, that in this very interesting Treatise, *Bishop Mountagu ably disproves the doctrine of your Church on the invocation of Saints*; shews the futility of all argument for it from reason, from Scripture, and from the Fathers; in short, he concludes it, to use his own words, a point of plain folly and ridiculous absurditie, as it is laid downe: even by “ the most learned, judicious, and advised amongst them,” and “ in point of practice and performance, by the simple vulgar people, not acquainted with, nor capable of scholasticall niceties, or difference in termes, of Invocation and Advocation, Helpe originall, and derived;” it is “ *flat Impietie against God, and Idolatrie* in their ordinarie devotion unto the creature.”* And yet, so decidedly on this point was the Church of England in his day opposed to yours, that Bishop Mountagu was charged with “ Poperie,” for even making the small admission which we have seen above.

I venture to predict, Sir, that we shall hear no more panegyrics on this Bishop, from you or Dr. Milner.

* See “ The Epistle Dedicatorie.”

There remains one other authority cited against us, both by yourself and by Dr. Milner, on which I will say a few words, once for all, I mean Martin Luther. We venerate the memory of that great Reformer, and humbly thank God for those greatest of all blessings, religious liberty, and its consequence, religious truth, of which he was the instrument. But we are too true to his principles to admit all, or nearly all, of his opinions. In many of the points, in which he differed from the other Fathers of the Reformation, we think him in error. We are, in short, as you well know, not Lutherans; though a great theological authority, the *Edinburgh Review*,* has recently in all seriousness pronounced that we are such; that there are in England no less than nine millions of that denomination, and in Ireland, five hundred thousand Lutherans, (synonymous with members of the Established Church,) in contradistinction to other Protestants.

* No. lxxxii. p. 376.

LETTER III.

Relics.—Images.—The Cross.

YOUR next particular is thus introduced; “pursuing the same method, in respect to *the Cross*, and *Relics of the Saints*, I shall transcribe “the decree of the Council of Trent upon “them:” and, having said this, you quote a short passage respecting *Images*.

The Cross shall be considered presently: but, meanwhile, permit me to express my astonishment at the manner in which you thus venture to dispose of *Relics*. Instead of keeping the promise, which you have made,—instead of “transcribing the decree of the Council of “Trent upon them,” you absolutely suppress every single syllable which the Council says about them. Is this dealing fairly by us? Has the Council been as silent on the subject of *Relics* as you are pleased to insinuate? Far otherwise; its decree,—in the same page, and immediately preceding the passage which you quote,—is as precise, as full of matter important to our enquiry, on this point as on the

other. It must be my business to supply your deficiency, which I will endeavour to do in as few words as the case will admit.

The Council first declares “that the holy
 “bodies of Martyrs and other Saints (which
 “bodies when living were members of Christ,
 “and the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and will
 “hereafter be raised by him to eternal life, and
 “glorified) *are to be venerated* by the faithful.”
 Here you have a positive command of the
 practice:—It next says, that “*by these bodies*
 “*many benefits are conferred by God on men;*” here
 you have a reward and encouragement for your
 obedience. Lastly, the Council consigns to
 utter condemnation, “all who affirm, either
 “that veneration and honour are not *due* to the
 “relics of Saints; or that the honour paid to
 “them, and the other sacred memorials, is
 “useless, and who say that it is in vain for the
 “sake of obtaining their aid (the aid of Relics
 “and other sacred memorials) to frequent the
 “Sepulchres of the Saints.”*

* Sess. xxv. “Sanctorum quoque Martyrum, et aliorum
 “cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quæ viva membra fue-
 “runt Christi, et templum Spiritûs Sancti, ab ipso ad æternam
 “vitam suscitanda et glorificanda, a fidelibus veneranda esse: *per*
 “*quæ* multa beneficia a Deo hominibus præstantur: ita ut affir-
 “mans Sanctorum Reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non

Surely, Sir, this is not a passage altogether without meaning ; it is not one, which ought to have been omitted by you, even, if you had not expressly promised to give it. For it proves, beyond contradiction, that your Church teaches the people to look to *Relics*, as means by which blessings may be obtained from God. It proves, therefore, (in spite of a feeble caution which for form's sake is afterwards added,) that the monstrous and degrading superstitions, which have been practised in this matter, have not been the mere unauthorised follies of individuals: but that your Church, as a Church, is deeply responsible for them; that they are the natural, the necessary, results of her own doctrine, and are almost sanctioned by her own formal and solemn decree.

But even this decree of the Council is not all. Its Catechism is more particular. Assuming as notorious, that *there is virtue in Relics*; it asks, how is this truth confirmed? The answer is

deberi ; vel eas, aliaque sacra monumenta, a fidelibus inutiliter honorari; atque eorum opis impetrandæ causa Sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari ; omninò damnandos esse, prout jam pridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat Ecclesia." It is afterwards said "*Omnis porrò superstitio in Sanctorum invocatione, Reliquiarum veneratione, et Imaginum sacro usu tollatur.*"

“ by the miracles wrought at the Sepulchres of
 “ the Saints, by the lost eyes, hands, and other
 “ members, which have there been restored;
 “ by the dead recalled to life; by evil Spirits
 “ ejected from the bodies of the living.” “ If
 “ garments, handkerchiefs, or the shadow of
 “ Saints before they departed out of this life,
 “ expelled diseases, and repaired the wasted
 “ strength of the sick; who can dare to deny,
 “ that God, *by means of their sacred ashes, bones,*
 “ *and other Relics,* does still produce the same
 “ miraculous effects?”* On this passage I will
 not waste your time by making any remark.

Dr. Milner indeed tells us, that “ the memo-
 “ rials of religion” (a delicate phrase, under
 which he is pleased to veil two particulars,
 which he is rather shy of acknowledging,
 Images and Relics,) “ form no essential part of
 “ it;” and he promises those, who will become
 his converts, “ never to ask them whether they
 “ have a pious picture, relic, or even crucifix,
 “ in their possession.”† In short he gives it to
 be understood, that these matters are “ among
 “ the *adiaphora*,” things indifferent, “ which

* Cat. Rom. p. iii. c. 2. s. 8.

† End of Controversy, p. 259.

“ the Church may retain or take away, as she judges best.”

All this may sound very plausible in a Protestant country ; especially, if Dr. Milner (as, to do him justice, he strives hard) shall succeed in making us believe, that the only purpose for which Relics are retained, is, indeed, as “ memorials.” Still, in this case, the answer would be obvious, that your Church, while she retains Relics, especially while she bids her people repair to the Sepulchres of Saints on account of them, is more wilfully, more wantonly culpable for all the abuses resulting from the practice, than if she esteemed it a matter beyond her controul.

But will Dr. Milner dare openly to say, that your Church does not affirm that there is virtue in Relics ? and that Miracles are wrought by means of them ? If he will not, it is mere trifling to tell us, that your Church may, if she pleases, do that, which she never dreamed of doing, and which, on her own principles, it would be the utmost cruelty to do,—I mean, deprive her children of those miracles and blessings, which she has herself told them may be obtained from Relics. Before I close this subject, I must not forget, that your Church has sanctioned, or rather ordered, a form of

swearing by relics in a court of justice, as we swear by God. In the canon law,* an oath, prescribed to the accuser in certain cases, concludes in these words, “*so help thee God, and the Relics of these Saints.*”

I proceed to *Images*.

If inadvertence or any other cause has made you omit your promised citation of the decree respecting Relics, yet on this new subject, Images, we shall be sure of having the Council's real and full doctrine. Accordingly, you profess to exhibit it to us in the following terms: “*although* the images of Christ, the Virgin “Mother of God, and the other Saints, are to “be kept and retained, particularly in Churches, “and due honour and veneration paid to them, “*yet* we are not to believe, that there is any “divinity or power in them, for which *we re-* “*spect them*, or that any thing is to be asked “from them, or that trust is to be placed in “them, as the heathens of old trusted in their “idols.”

Indeed, indeed, Sir, it is not pleasant, to be obliged to remonstrate with you at every step. But why is it, that you will not be more guarded? Why is it, too, that you always

* Dec. 2 p. c. 35. q. 6. de Parentela. Swearing by Relics is referred to in another place, 1 c. 22 q. habemus.

mistake on one side? That you never by any chance exceed, but constantly fall short of, the real extent of the doctrine, which you undertake to exhibit?

According to your statement of this decree, the main purpose of the Council was to *prevent abuses* from the introduction and veneration of images; whereas their real object is expressly stated in the original to have been to *establish the duty* of having and paying veneration or worship, to images. Do you seriously think, that there is no difference between these two ways of understanding the decree? Again, will you maintain that the words “propter
“*quam sint colendæ*” are adequately rendered by you and by Dr. Milner,* “for which *we respect them?*” Lastly, and above all, can you, on reflection, hold yourself justified, in stopping short, as you have done, at the very point at which the decree begins to state, both the reason on which the veneration of images is grounded, and the extent to which it is actually carried? Let our readers judge between us, from the following literal translation of the original decree: “That the images of Christ, of
“the Virgin-Mother of God, and of the Saints,
“are to be had and retained, especially in
“Churches, and due honour and veneration to

* End of Controversy, p. 255.

“ be paid to them ; not because there is be-
 “ lieved to be any divinity or virtue in them,
 “ on account of which they are to be worship-
 “ ped ; or because from them any thing is to
 “ be asked ; or because trust is to be reposed
 “ on images, as the heathens of old put their
 “ trust in idols ; *but because* the honour which
 “ is exhibited to them is referred to the proto-
 “ types which they represent ; so that *through*
 “ *the images which we kiss, and before which we*
 “ *uncover our heads, and lie prostrate,* we adore
 “ Christ and pay veneration to the Saints,
 “ whose likeness the images bear : as is or-
 “ dained by the decrees of councils, particu-
 “ larly the second Nicene.*

Dr. Milner, in his “ End of Controversy,”†
 professing like you to state “ what the Ca-
 “ tholic Church herself has solemnly pro-
 “ nounced on the present subject, in her Ge-
 “ neral Council of Trent,” stops short at the
 same point as yourself. Nay, presently after-
 wards, having occasion to remark on a state-
 ment of Bishop Porteus, that these acts of
 veneration are rendered by your Church to
 images, he will not go further than a mere sup-
 position, for argument’s sake, that it may be
 so : “ *Supposing all this to be true,*”‡ says he.

* Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv.

† p. 256.

‡ Ib.

Really Dr. Milner excels every Controversialist I have chanced to meet with, in his faithful observance of the judicious maxim of Cicero, “*Qui semel verecundiæ fines transierit, eum benè et navitèr oportet esse impudentem.*”

But to return to the decree. From the latter part of it, omitted both by you, and by Dr. Milner, we have, I submit in the first place, a much better illustration of the meaning of the general terms “due honour and veneration,” than we can obtain by reference to any of the unauthorized expositions which you are pleased to recommend. Not but that much yet remains, for an explanation of which we must look elsewhere: but meanwhile a good deal of light is thrown upon our subject. “To kiss these images, not only of Christ but of the Saints, to uncover the head, and lie prostrate before them,” are, it appears, declared by the Council of Trent to be the proper, the ordinary, external expressions of the honour due to them: and this is going much further than any of the works mentioned by you have thought fit to state. One of the greatest lights of your Church, indeed, Cardinal Bellarmine,* says that “as to external acts of adoration, it is not easy to make distinction; for, generally speaking, the external acts are common

* De Sanct. Beat. lib. i. c. 12.

“to every species of worship, and the only
 “exception, the only peculiar rite, to be re-
 “served for the worship of God himself, is
 “sacrifice; and, what is connected with sacri-
 “fice, temples, altars, and priests.”

I will next remark on another part of the same omitted clause of the Council's decree, that its obvious meaning is to encourage the use of images, as the immediate, though not the ultimate, objects of religious worship: they are to be retained, because the adoration due to Christ may be conveniently paid to him, through the images which represent him: and of course the various acts of devotion, which it would be proper to exhibit, if the divine Redeemer were personally present, may with equal propriety be directed to his images, as long as we keep in mind that they are only the types and representations of his divinity. Such, I say, is the plain meaning of the words themselves: but it is made still plainer by the well known fact, that both before, and at the very time of the Council's sitting, the grand question respecting images, which divided the opinions of your doctors, was merely this, whether the adoration, on all hands allowed to be due to images, be entirely relative, entirely referred to the prototype, or be not in part objective, in part, that is, terminated on the images them-

selves, and so “whether there be not an “adoration due unto the image dedicated, by “virtue of the dedication, besides the reason “of the representation.” An historian* of that council informs us, that “for satisfaction of “both parties it was concluded, that the former opinion should be expressed as more “facile and plain, but without words, which “might prejudice the other.”

The great authority for the opinion, thus favoured by the council, was St. Thomas Aquinas, whose powers you so highly and so justly extol. I do not affect to be deeply versed in his writings; but I have read enough of them to bear testimony to the uncommon vigour, and, above all, the astonishing acuteness of his mind. From his “Summa” I beg leave to present you with the following extract, not as an authoritative exposition of your Church’s doctrine; (for you have not gone so far as to acknowledge him such;) but to prove, that the consequence, which I have drawn above from the words of the Council of Trent, was in fact drawn from the principle there laid down, by the greatest of your scholastic divines.

St. Thomas tells us, that the image of Christ receives no reverence as it is a piece of wood, or a sculpture, or a picture, for reverence be-

* Father Paul, p. 745.

longs only to a rational being; it is revered, therefore, as it is an image (that is, as it represents a rational being); and since this is the case, the reverence paid to the image of Christ must be the same, as is paid to Christ himself. To prove this doctrine, he answers the objections brought against it. First, of the divine commandment he says in plain terms, that "it does not forbid the worship of images further than as it forbids the worship of the originals:" if therefore under the Jewish dispensation there could have been any image of God, it would have been lawful to have worshipped it: "but of an incorporeal God there could be no corporeal image. Under the new dispensation, however, as God has been made man, *he may now be worshipped in a corporeal image.*"

The second objection he thus states: that the apostle forbids us to "have fellowship with the unfruitful works of the Gentiles," and he has elsewhere declared, that the worst of these unfruitful works was "changing the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of an image of corruptible man." To this he answers, that the adoration of images among the Gentiles was an "unfruitful work," and therefore condemned by the apostle, only in two ways, first, as some of them adored images,

merely on their own account, thinking that a divine power resided in them, and secondly, when in the images they worshipped the beings represented by them, yet because to these beings, though themselves only creatures, they gave in their images divine adoration. "Now," says he, "we offend in neither of these ways, *when we give divine adoration to the image of Christ*; not in the first, for we do not worship the image on its own account; not in the second, for the being, whom we worship in the image, is the true God."*

Such was the doctrine of St. Thomas. It is true, that Cardinal Bellarmine, shocked at the length to which he has gone, makes the following very pertinent observation upon it: "To tell the people that the image of Christ, or that the cross, is to be adored with the worship of latria, the very same with which God is worshipped, is not without great danger: for they who maintain this position, are obliged to use very subtle distinctions, which they themselves hardly understand, much less the unlearned multitude."†

It is also true, that St. Thomas's doctrine (though in accordance with that of St. Bona-

* Par. 3. q. 25. art. 3.

† De Imag. lib. ii. c. 22.

venture, Cardinal Caietan, and others) was in direct opposition to a much higher authority than any of them, I mean the second Council of Nice; the scandal whereof is so great that Bellarmine is driven to conjecture,* that St. Thomas had never seen the acts of that Council, a supposition which is rather awkward, considering that one of the characteristics of a General Council is, that “their sound is gone out into all lands, and their word unto the ends of the world;” and yet, the greatest of schoolmen, it seems, five hundred years after the Council had sate, was an utter stranger to its proceedings! But awkward as this supposition is, it is nevertheless absolutely necessary; otherwise a still more awkward alternative presents itself. For either the second Nicene Council, approved by Pope Hadrian, accepted by the whole Church, and declared to be a General Council by the inspired assembly at Trent, was no General Council, and so the infallible Church hath erred; or else St. Thomas, the angelic doctor, in spite of his Sainthood, aye, and St. Bonaventure too, the seraphic doctor, who is declared in the bull of his canonization to have discoursed on “these

* De Imag. lib. ii. c. 22.

“ matters as if the Holy Spirit spoke by his “ mouth,” were no better than rank heretics.

But it is time to come to the second Nicene Council, whose claims to the title of a General Council you will not venture to dispute.

Its doctrine on the worship of images was, as I have said, contrary to that of St. Thomas, so far as concerns Latria, the highest kind of worship, limited by the decree of the Council to God alone. This was not to be paid to images: they were to receive no more than a secondary worship, entitled *τιμητικη προσκυνησις*. But as this is not a very definite expression, it will be necessary to look more minutely into the acts of the Council, in order that we may understand what the holy fathers meant by it; and, to this end, especially what was the value and importance ascribed by them to images. I will afterwards adduce some extracts from their decrees.

I am aware, that a very lively and ingenious member of your communion, Dr. Lingard, protests* against such an inquiry. He says that you have nothing to do with the Acts of the Council, that you only acknowledge the doctrinal decree passed in its last session.

* Lingard's Tracts, p. 238.

I should be sorry to make either Dr. Lingard or yourself answerable for a single particle of doctrine which you disclaim. You, as individuals, may reject what you please. But my inquiry is concerned with the doctrine of your Church; and for that I shall not scruple to go to those sources which the Church has recognized.

I say then, that the acts of this Council, generally, and not merely the final decree, are recognized by an authority admitted by yourself, I mean the Trent Catechism. It is there declared, that the second commandment (as we call it) forbids the making representations of the deity, "as is more largely explained in the "second Nicene Council:"* but the explanation, here referred to, is found in the earlier acts of the Council, not in its final decree, where not even an allusion to this subject occurs.

I will presently beg leave to address a few words to you, with more particular reference to Dr. Lingard; but, meanwhile, having precluded all cavil against the authority of the Acts of this Council, I shall proceed to make some extracts from them, and from the relations cited therein. I do this, I repeat, in order to ascer-

* Cat. Rom. p. iii. c. ii. s. 11.

tain what sort of consideration and respect the Council had for images, what sort of worship, therefore, it meant to enjoin by the term *τίμητικὴ προσκύνησις*.

Now, in the testimonies adduced by the Council in favour of the worship of images, they are represented in the most honourable terms, but certainly not more so than accords with the effects ascribed to them. Prayer is addressed to them, and answers to these prayers are sometimes given from the images themselves. Miracles are wrought by them, almost as a matter of course. The works of our blessed Lord are in some instances studiously imitated, and the language of the evangelists copied and travestied. But I will beg leave to exhibit two or three specimens of these testimonies; premising that it is expressly said that the Council "heard and believed" them, and that they are among the principal human grounds of their infallible decrees.

The two first are occurrences of a very ordinary stamp; but they are worth adducing on account of the authority on which they rest, that of "the most holy Constantine, Bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus," who declares to

* Labbe, Conc. tom. vii. p. 269.

the Council, that they happened within his own knowledge.

“ A carter went, with his goad in his hand, “ into one of the Churches in that city to say “ his prayers. In the midst of his devotions “ he chanced to see an image of the Virgin in “ colours on the wall; upon which he lifted up “ his goad, and struck out the right eye of the “ figure. On leaving the Church, he returned “ to his team, and soon afterwards having occasion to use his goad, the instrument broke, a “ fragment entered his right eye, and blinded “ him. This man,” adds the Bishop, with much naïveté, “ I myself have seen, and *I know him “ to have only one eye.*”

“ Another man,” says the same venerable authority, “ of the city of Citium, in the same “ island, being employed to hang a Church “ with veils in honour of the festival of the “ blessed Virgin’s assumption, in the course of “ his work drove a nail into the forehead of an “ image of St. Peter painted on one of the “ walls. He fastened his rope, and spread the “ veil; but before an hour was over, he was “ seized with an intolerable pain in his head, “ particularly in his forehead. This continued “ the two days of the festival, during which he “ lay in great torment. It happened, however,

“ that the Bishop of Citium heard of the occurrence; and he, after giving the man a severe reprimand, directed him to go and take the nail out of the image. He did so; and, as soon as the nail was extracted, his pain ceased.”

As the Bishop of Citium was himself present in Council, he was very properly called upon to attest the truth of this narrative, which he did without hesitation, on his oath.*

The next case is read as an extract from the life of St. Symeon Stylites, the “ *μεγα θαυμα* “ of the habitable globe,” of whom it is further stated that images of him were placed in the vestibules of all the workshops in Rome, as a guard and protection to those who placed them.†

“ A Lady of Rhosopolis in Cilicia, by name Theotecna, lived with her husband twenty years, but had the misfortune to be childless. She was indeed, and from her earliest childhood had been, vexed with a Devil,” (who, from what follows, seems to have had some pretensions to her personal preference.)—“ At the end of twenty years, her husband, having lost all patience at so long a disappointment of his

* Labbe, Conc. tom. vii. p. 269.

† p. 265.

“ hopes of issue, dismissed her from his house.
 “ Luckily for her, she found a Caravan just
 “ about to set off on a pilgrimage to St. Symeon;
 “ and she was but too happy to join the com-
 “ pany.

“ As soon as her devil came within sight of
 “ St. Symeon, he gnashed his teeth, and was
 “ in the greatest torture, seeing *the spiritual*
 “ *Image of the Saint*, (τὴν πνευματικὴν αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα)
 “ which thus addressed him in a human voice.
 “ ‘I’ll drive thee from her, thou wicked and
 “ ‘foul fiend, and she shall go back to her hus-
 “ ‘band, and have a child within a twelve-
 “ ‘month.’—The Devil bellowed in return, ‘It
 “ ‘is no business of yours: what harm have I
 “ ‘ever done to you, that you drive me away
 “ ‘from my Wife? And you will give them a
 “ ‘child too, will you? though she never had
 “ ‘one to me!’—Saint Symeon, after giving him
 “ a good rating, commands him to ‘run off,
 “ ‘like a vile slave, as he was, and draw water,
 “ ‘and gather sticks, and be burned all the
 “ ‘while with a fiery flame.’ The words are
 “ no sooner out of the saint’s mouth, than the
 “ Devil begins to do as he is bid,—but with a
 “ very bad grace, roaring and moaning; and
 “ jumping about, the whole time. At last,
 “ when he had finished the job the Saint had

“ set him, in the presence of all the people, at
“ the sight of a flash of lightning which was
“ coming against him, he set up a fresh howl,
“ and out he came. Immediately, the poor
“ Lady finds herself quite recovered, and re-
“ ceives from St. Symeon the comfortable as-
“ surance, that her husband has had a wonderful
“ change wrought in his heart towards her by
“ the divine interposition. Accordingly she
“ goes home to him, is received with open
“ arms, becomes a joyful mother before the
“ year is out, and lives very happy ever after-
“ wards.

“ In the midst of all her happiness, however,
“ she does not forget her benefactor. At a
“ very early opportunity, she and her husband
“ took their babe with them to shew him to
“ the Saint, and to pour forth their devout
“ acknowledgments of the blessings they owed
“ to him. But their gratitude does not end
“ here : immediately after their return, the Lady,
“ instructed by a special revelation from Hea-
“ ven, set up an image of the Saint in one of
“ the inner apartments of her house: which
“ Image was soon the resort of the whole neigh-
“ bourhood, on account of the astonishing mira-
“ cles which it wrought; for *the Holy Spirit,*
“ *which dwelt in St. Symeon himself, overshadowed*

“ *this Image of him.* In particular, one woman, “ having had an issue of blood fifteen years, “ *coming near in faith,* departed after seeing the “ Image, and immediately her issue stanchèd: “ for she said within herself if I may but see “ the likeness of him, I shall be whole.”*

I have thought it necessary, at the risk of tiring my readers, to recount this story at full length, as illustrating the character I have already given of the Council's Hagiography in several points at once. Now I am perfectly ready to admit to you† and Dr. Milner,‡ that in our own Church, even after the Reformation, belief in the effects of Witchcraft induced some of our most pious Bishops, and wisest men, to believe, and act on, stories scarcely less absurd though certainly none so profane. But there is this most important difference in the two cases. Our Church, even in its most formal Synod, is still a fallible body: from false premises it can only come to false conclusions; but then, as soon as it has discovered its errors, it can freely abandon them. This is a privilege, which not a man among us would consent to

* Compare Matt. ix. 20. and Luke viii. 44. particularly in the original.

† Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 48.

‡ End of Controversy, p. 251.

barter for that infallibility, which you so loudly vaunt; but which, like other high prerogatives, is sometimes found by experience to be productive of serious embarrassment; and never, I believe, has the embarrassment been felt more serious, than under the necessity of defending the antient doctrine of your Church on the honour due to Images. You and your Reverend Friend adopt the easiest course, by dissembling your knowledge of the doctrine which is to be defended.

But I must return to the Council, and exhibit one more of its pious histories, principally for the sake of a collateral point of some moment, which is connected with it. It appears, indeed, to have been a great favourite with the Council, for it was recited more than once in the course of their proceedings. It was also a favourite with Cardinal Bellarmine, who, in his ninth argument for the worship of Images,* adduces this history as an instance of *the hatred, which the Devil beareth to them*. But, really, if the Devil is still in that mind; if he is not “now grown “wiser than of yore;” if, after more than eleven centuries of Image-worship by Christians, he persisteth in hating Images,—he is not the cun-

* Bell. de Imag. lib. 2. c. 12.

ning Devil the world takes him to be.—But for the History,* which was recited from the “Limonarium of Sophronius Archbishop of Jerusalem.”

“A certain Hermit was harassed by the dæmon of Incontinence. One day, when the Devil was attacking him more furiously than usual, the old man burst into tears, and remonstrated with his enemy for never leaving him alone; but being as hard upon him in his old age, as in the prime and vigour of his youth. On hearing this, the Devil presents himself in a visible shape, and proposes a compromise. ‘Swear to me,’ says he, ‘that you will tell no one what I am going to say to you: and I will have done with you.’ The terms are accepted: the old man swears by ‘Him who dwelleth in the highest,’ that he will never mention it to any one. ‘Well then,’ says the Devil, ‘do not worship this Image,’ pointing to one of the blessed Virgin with the Child Jesus in her arms, ‘and I will never attack you again.’—‘Let me think about it,’ was the answer; and so they parted.

“Next day, the hermit goes to the Abbot

* Labbe, Con. tom. vii. p. 252.

“Theodore, (who himself related the incident
“to Sophronius,) and tells him all that has
“passed. ‘Upon my word, Father,’ says the
“Abbot, ‘you have been finely duped, in taking
“‘this oath to the Devil. However, you have
“‘done perfectly right in breaking it, and
“‘telling me your case. As to the main point,
“‘let me tell you, *you had better not leave a*
“‘*single brothel in this city unvisited, than refuse*
“‘*to worship our Lord Jesus with his Mother*
“‘*in Image.*’ The good man, comforted and
“strengthened by this ghostly counsel, departs
“in peace, and in their next rencontre bids the
“Devil do his worst.”

On the first recital of this edifying narrative, the Synod is filled with more than ordinary exultation. The most holy Bishop of Constantia exclaims in a fervour of devout zeal: “Like
“necklaces of beads of gold is the wonderful
“harmony of our inspired fathers in teaching
“us to worship Images!” After him, “the
“most devout Monk, John, deputy of the Ori-
“ental Sees,” reminds his brethren, that this
history of Father Sophronius’s not only teaches
them to worship Images, but also contains a
further lesson, that it is right to break an oath
made for their subversion. “I say this,” says
he, “because there are persons, who make a

“pretence of their Oaths.” So ridiculous a plea is treated with deserved contempt; *the conduct of the Hermit is compared to St. Peter’s denial of our Saviour with an oath, and afterwards repenting*; and in a word, the absurdity of the scruple is deemed so very manifest, that Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, cuts short the pious eloquence of some other Fathers, who were about to enlarge upon it.

It is but justice to the liberality of the Council, to state, that the quality of the personage, to whom the Hermit had taken his oath, is not permitted to affect the argument. They are determined solely by the matter of the Hermit’s oath, as it involved a renunciation of the worship of Images: so that to my protestant readers the judgment of these holy Fathers may be more simply stated thus; *it is a greater Sin to keep the second commandment, than to break the third and the seventh.*

After the various passages have been read, of which I have just given a sample,* the Session

* Besides these legends, there are also some other authorities produced: 1st, some texts of Scripture, as Heb. xi. 21. Exodus xxv. 18. Ezekiel xli. 18. Heb. ix. 5. and several passages from the Psalms. These texts are so very little to the purpose, that it would be a waste of time to remark on them. 2. Some passages from authors entitled to respect, (Chrysostom, Cyril,

of the day concludes with this exclamation of the whole Synod. "The* Instructions of the Fathers, speaking with the mouth of God, have set us right. From them we have drawn and drunk the words of truth. Following them, we have expelled falsehood. Taught by them, we embrace the venerable Images. Let those who do not so, 'be Anathema,' *be cut off from God:*" *for such is the force of Anathema, according to the Council's express definition.* Among other Anathemas are the following, against all who do not call Images holy and sacred,—against all, who apply to them the declarations of Scripture against Idols,—against all who insult or dishonour them,—against all who knowingly communicate with such,†—*against all who do not worship Images, or who doubt of, or are disaffected to the worship*

Gregory of Nyssa,) which prove indeed that there were pictures in existence, but give not the remotest hint of their being employed in worship. 3. A spurious epistle from Basil the great to Julian the apostate, in which the Roman doctrine is roundly maintained. But unfortunately it is made to prove too much; it is indeed so palpable and clumsy a forgery, that even Romanists themselves will not venture to assert its genuineness.—These several authorities, however, occupy a very inconsiderable share of the Council's attention, which is chiefly given to the edifying tales, of which I have spoken above.

* Page 317.

† Page 317.

of them.* And the Council, in making these Anathemas, pronounces itself “secured from error by the energy of the Holy Ghost, and by the Traditions of the Fathers and the Church.”

I am sorry to have also to tell you, that you yourself seem to have fallen under the Council’s malediction: for you tell us, that you only “venerate the Images of Saints as memorials, that bring their virtues and rewards to our minds and hearts.”† Indeed, if the gift of prophecy, as well as those of wisdom and of knowledge, were claimed for these holy Fathers, I should suppose that, in the following passage, they were directly forewarning the more orthodox believers against the delusions of the modern champions of your Church. “As for them who say it is sufficient to have Images for the sake of exciting their livelier remembrance of the prototypes, and *not for worship*, as they reject one part of the truth, and admit the other, they are ἡμιφauλοι, half-bad, ψευδαληθεις, speakers of truth and falsehood, in a breath. Alas their madness!” This madness, however, does not protect them from being included

* Page 584.

† Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 103.

in the general anathema, which is repeated pretty often in the course of these proceedings.

One word more. In one of the most formal of all the Council's decrees, to which all the Fathers separately subscribed, at the end of the *Actio quarta*, it is expressly pronounced that Images are retained and worshipped, "not only " that by memory we may ascend to the proto-
" type, but also, *that we may be made partakers*
" *of some sanctification.*"* It is afterwards said, that "by worshipping them and giving them
" honorary adoration, *we actually do partake of*
" *sanctification.*"*—Lastly, after telling the people, that it is of no consequence by what name the worship paid to Images be called, be it salutation or adoration, (provided that latria, the highest kind, which is due only to God, be not understood by it,) there is the following exhortation. "However *let every one take care that*
" *he be worthy of making this adoration: if he be*
" *not worthy, let him first purify himself, and so*
" *let him come to the holy representative Image.*"*

And thus much for the II. Nicene Council;—a Council, be it remembered, whose inspiration must be as strenuously maintained by you, as any, or every, part of your whole system;—

* Labbe, Con. tom. vii. p. 540.

a Council, on whose perfect infallibility, in its decrees, the infallibility of your Church, and all its other high pretensions, absolutely depend,—with it, that Church itself must stand or fall.

From this view of the *doctrine* of your Church on the worship of Images, I turn to its authorized and prescribed *practice*, as set forth in your public Liturgy.

There are two festivals appointed in honour of the true Cross, one to commemorate its discovery, an event, to which, we are told in the lesson of the day, Helena, Mother of the Emperor Constantine, was led by a Revelation made to her in a dream;—the other in honour of its recovery by the Emperor Heraclius, fourteen years after it had been carried away into Persia by the victorious Chosroas. The identity of the Cross is stated, on both occasions, to have been ascertained by miracles. In the former instance, three Crosses having been found together, nearly three hundred years after the Crucifixion,—and it being uncertain, on which of the three our Lord was suspended,—they were all applied in succession to the body of a Woman labouring under a violent disease. The application of two of the three was utterly without effect: but, immediately,

on the third touching her, she was healed. It is afterwards declared, that “at the touch of “the Cross the dead are recalled to life, and “the mighty things of God made known.”*

In the services of both days a Hymn is sung, one stanza of which is literally translated thus:

Hail o Cross, our only hope,

In this Paschal festivity,

Bring to the pious an increase of righteousness,

And to Sinners grant pardon of their Sins.†

It appears from Bellarmine,‡ that on this Hymn many of your most distinguished divines (among them St. Thomas,§ St. Bonaventure, and Cardinal Caietan) grounded the notion which they held, that the highest kind of worship, Latria, is due to Images of Christ. In order to remove the force of their argument, Bellarmine is pleased to say, “either the Cross

* Brev. Rom. In die Invent. sanctæ Crucis, lect. v.

† O Crux ave, spes unica,

In hoc Paschali gaudio

Auge piis justitiam,

Reisque dona veniam.

‡ Bell. de Imag. l. 2. c. 20.

§ The opinions of St. Thomas seem to be recognized as worthy of peculiar respect: for the following is the language of a Prayer addressed to him in the Breviary on his Festival, 7th of March; “*O Doctor optime, Ecclesiæ sanctæ lumen, beate Thoma, divinæ legis amator, deprecare pro nobis filium Dei.*”

“ is here taken for Christ himself crucified”; or else the address is merely a metaphorical *protopopœia*, as Moses (Deut. xxxii.) cries out, “ Hear, O ye Heavens, and I will speak.”

But it is obvious to reply, that as, by Bellarmine’s own statement, it is not clear which of these solutions is the true one, so neither can it be certain that either of them is; at any rate the multitude can only be expected to take the words in their plain meaning—a meaning so plain as not only to demand the assent, but also (as we have seen) to be made the foundation of the judgment, of many of your divines.

But to proceed: the hymn is followed by an Address to the Cross in prose—“ O Cross, more
“ resplendent than all the stars, &c. &c. save
“ this present congregation assembled in thy
“ praises. Hallelujah! Hallelujah!”

Afterwards the Priest says, “ *We adore thy*
“ *Cross*, O Lord, and celebrate thy passion: by
“ whom,” &c.

If it be said that this is not properly an instance of Image-worship, being the worship of the *true* Cross, the following honours paid to the *Images* of this true Cross may be worth reciting.

My first instance shall be taken from the Ro-

man Missal.* “ The Priest receives from the
 “ Deacon a Cross prepared for him, and turning
 “ towards the people, uncovers a part of it from
 “ the top, beginning alone; ‘ Behold the wood
 “ ‘ of the Cross’—the choir sing ‘ Come, let us
 “ ‘ adore’; and, while this is singing, all the
 “ congregation throw themselves prostrate.
 “ Then the Priest uncovers more and more of the
 “ Cross, raising it by slow degrees higher than
 “ it was at first:—the Antiphonema proceeds,
 “ ‘ Behold the wood of the Cross, on which
 “ ‘ the salvation of the world was suspended;
 “ ‘ come, let us adore.’ This is thrice repeated.
 “ Then the Priest, uncovering the whole of the
 “ Cross, and laying it in its place before the
 “ altar, *takes off his shoes, and draws near to adore,*
 “ *thrice bowing his knees before kissing the Cross.*
 “ He then returns to the seat, and puts on his
 “ shoes again. Afterwards, the ministers of the
 “ altar, and the rest in succession, thrice bow-
 “ ing their knees, as aforesaid, *adore the Cross*
 “ *(crucem adorant).* They afterwards sing,
 “ ‘ *We adore thy Cross, O Lord,*’ &c. *The ado-*
 “ *ration of the Cross being finished,* the Deacon
 “ reverently receives the Cross, and carries it
 “ back to the altar.”

* Feria 6, in Parasceve Domini.

My next citation shall be from the *Pontificale Romanum** “*De Benedictione novæ Crucis.*”

“A new Cross, or tablet on which is depicted the Crucifix, is blessed in this manner:— Frankincense, and a censer, with fire and holy-water, being prepared, the Pontiff, standing with his mitre on his head, says,” here follow some prayers, of which this is one:— “ ‘ We beseech Thee, Holy Lord, Almighty Father, everlasting God, to vouchsafe to ‘ bless this wood of thy Cross, that it may be ‘ a saving remedy to mankind,—that it may ‘ be to them the strengthening of faith, the increase of good works, and the redemption of ‘ their souls,—that it may be their comfort, ‘ protection and defence, against the cruel ‘ darts of their enemies, through our Lord ‘ Jesus Christ.’ &c.

“Then frankincense is offered to the Pontiff “in a vessel,” which he blesses in a formal prayer; “which being done, the Pontiff puts

* *Pontificale Romanum*, Clementis VIII. et Urbani VIII. jussu editum, a Benedicto XIV. recog. et castigatum. Venetiis, 1786.

This book is not, like the Breviary and the Missal, mentioned in the Decree of the Council of Trent; but it is of undoubted authority, “*ad omnes Pontificias Cæremonias, quibus nunc utitur sacrosancta E. R. accommodatum.*” It is cited as such by Bossuet, “*Exposition,*” sect v.

“ the frankincense into the censer; he then
 “ sprinkles the Cross with holy-water, and
 “ afterwards censes it. Then, standing un-
 “ covered, he says, ‘ *Blessed be this wood, in the*
 “ ‘ *name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the*
 “ ‘ *Holy Ghost: and may the blessing of that*
 “ ‘ wood, on which the holy members of our
 “ ‘ Saviour were suspended, be in this wood,
 “ ‘ *that they who pray and bow themselves propter*
 “ ‘ *Deum before this Cross may find sanctification*
 “ ‘ *both of body and soul, through the same*
 “ ‘ Jesus Christ our Lord.’

“ Then the Pontiff, *kneeling before the Cross,*
 “ *devoutly adores it and kisses it:** the same is
 “ done by as many others as will.

“ Then follows a long prayer to be made in
 “ case the Cross is of metal; in which, among
 “ other things, our Lord is thus besought:—
 “ ‘ Accept this Cross with those hands, with
 “ ‘ which thou didst embrace that’ on which
 “ thou sufferedst: ‘ and out of the sanctity of
 “ ‘ that Cross, sanctify this; and, as by *that*
 “ ‘ the world was delivered from all guilt, so let
 “ ‘ the very devout souls of thy servants, who
 “ ‘ now offer, by the merit of this cross be

* “ Tum Pontifex, flexis ante Crucem genibus, *ipsam devotè*
 “ *adorat, et osculatur.*”

“ ‘freed from every sin committed by them,’
 “ &c. Afterwards, the Pontiff, kneeling before
 “ the Cross, *devoutly adores it, and kisses it.*”

In the same Pontificale, the very next particular is “ *The form of blessing an Image of the Virgin*”; in which, after singing a prayer to the Virgin herself, (before cited by me from the Breviary,) “ To thy protecting care we fly, O Holy Mother of God ; despise not our prayers in our necessities, but from all dangers always deliver us, O Virgin, glorious and blessed,” the Pontiff prays to God in terms, which I shudder while I transcribe :—“ Al-
 “ mighty, everlasting God, by whose most mer-
 “ ciful providence all things are created out
 “ of nothing, *vouchsafe to bless and sanctify this*
 “ *Image, prepared in veneration to the honour of*
 “ *the most pious Mother of thy Son our Lord*
 “ *Jesus Christ:* and grant, O most merciful
 “ Father, by the invocation of thy name, and of
 “ the name of the same thy only-begotten Son
 “ our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to thy
 “ will, was incarnate for the salvation of man-
 “ kind of the ever-Virgin Mary—*quatenus**
 “ *precibus ejusdem sacratissimæ virginis, that*

* I give these words in the original, not seeing exactly how to render them.

“ whoever shall strive suppliantly to honour
 “ the same Queen of Mercy, and our most
 “ gracious Lady, before this Image, may both
 “ be rescued from impending dangers, and in
 “ the sight of thy Divine Majesty may obtain
 “ pardon of all their sins, and may likewise
 “ acquire in the present life that grace which
 “ they long for, and in the world to come may
 “ rejoice with thy elect in everlasting salvation,
 “ through the same our Lord.”

And now, Sir, permit me to ask you, whether
 the doctrine of your Church respecting Images
 be merely what the works cited by you state it
 to be? Are the devotions, which we have been
 examining, what Dr. Milner means by “ the
 “ *decent respect*, which,” he says, “ Roman-
 “ Catholics shew to the memorials of Chris-
 “ tianity” *? Will he any longer persist in main-
 taining, that “ the end for which pious pictures
 “ and images are made and retained in your
 “ Church, *is the same for which pictures and*
 “ *images are made and retained by mankind in ge-*
 “ *neral—to put us in mind of the persons and*
 “ *things they represent*”? and that “ the relative
 “ veneration to which they are entitled” is no
 other than “ the honour which Protestants

* End of Controversy, p. 254.

“ themselves pay to the Bible, the name of Jesus, and even to the King’s throne”?*

If, indeed, your doctrine were only this, could it so often have led its followers to the practice of direct idolatry? Or could the rulers of your Church have hesitated one instant to forbid all Images, when the use of them was so little necessary, and the abuse so common and so tremendous? If it were only this, could cardinals, and popes, and saints, have so grossly misconceived, or so impiously perverted it? If it were only this, could the assembled piety and wisdom of the universal Church; above all, could that Holy Spirit, whom the Lord of life and love sent into the world to bless, to comfort, and to support his children—could He, guiding by his secret influence the decisions of a general council, condemn the impugners of such a doctrine to eternal torments? Could He, for so slight an error, have shut us out from all hopes of mercy, have denied us all share in our Redeemer’s merits, made us outcasts from his love, and aliens from his inheritance? Is it thus his blessed promise is fulfilled, that “ even the “ bruised reed he will not break, and the “ smoking flax he will not quench”? Has that

* End of Controversy, pp. 258, 259.

Holy Spirit told us, that “ we shall not make
“ to ourselves any graven image, nor the like-
“ ness of any thing in heaven, in earth, or under
“ the earth; that we shall not bow down to
“ them nor worship them;” and does the same
Spirit cut us off for ever, if yet we scruple to
respect and venerate them? Is the exact mea-
sure of observance due to Images, by the will
of God, so very nice, so very delicately poised,
and yet is mistake on either side big with dan-
ger to our soul’s salvation?

Will you dare to answer these questions in
the affirmative? If you will not, you must
acknowledge, that the representation of your
Church’s doctrine, made by your modern apo-
logists, is, in this instance, false and deceitful.

LETTER IV.

Dr. Lingard. His unfaithfulness in quotation.

IN enquiring, in my last letter, into the Acts of the II. Nicene Council, I said that “Dr. Lingard protests altogether against such enquiry, and declares that your Church acknowledges only the Council’s doctrinal decree passed in its last session.” In answer to this statement, I then satisfied myself with shewing, that the previous Acts of the Council are admitted, as authoritative, even by the Trent Catechism. But, as this Council’s proceedings have been found very important in my view of the doctrine of your Church respecting Images, I now think it right to give more particular attention to Dr. Lingard’s assertions, and shall thus at the same time fulfil my promise of addressing to you a few words respecting Dr. Lingard himself.

That gentleman is, I believe, among the most distinguished living writers of your Church. By yourself he is repeatedly mentioned in terms of very high respect: for although he is not cited as one of your Vouchers for the doc-

trines of your Church, yet, as an historian, he is warmly commended by you, more especially for his accuracy and precision, and for “constantly citing the authorities upon which his relations are founded.”* It is said, indeed, by those who have read his history, (I am not in that number,) that the main part of your historical facts are derived from him.

It is plain, therefore, on all these accounts, that it will be by no means a superfluous labour, to dwell a little more at large on the manner in which he has treated the II. Nicene Council. The result may not only be useful in establishing more fully the authority of that Council's Acts, a matter of much moment in the enquiry in which I am engaged:—but it may also afford a specimen of the method, in which your modern ecclesiastical historian disposes of subjects, which are not quite agreeable to him; and may thus assist his readers in estimating the value of his authority in all questions of doubtful evidence.

I have said that I am not in the number of those who have read Dr. Lingard's history; and I will frankly tell you my reason.

It happened to me, several years ago, to be

* “Book,” &c. p. 28. note, and p. 193.

engaged in a controversy with him,—the attack and defence of a charge delivered by the present Bishop of Durham: and, on that occasion, I had so frequent opportunities of experiencing the very peculiar use, which he thinks himself at liberty to make, of the writings of antient authors, that I felt no inclination to sit down to a work of his, the merit of which must entirely depend on his faithfulness to the authorities which he cites.

In the course of our controversy, I made pretty copious extracts from the Acts of the II. Nicene Council, (of which, indeed, I have not scrupled to avail myself in my preceding letter to you): and in his answer, which closed the controversy, he makes the statement to which I have before referred. “ *The Acts of this Council,*” says he, “ *are of no authority in the Catholic Church.* We assent, indeed, to the doctrinal decree passed in the last session, *which was approved by the Popes:* but in the *Acts and Canons much is contained to which the Roman Church would never impart its sanction.* *Quæ apud nos nec habentur, nec admittuntur,*” says Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *a Roman writer of the same age.*”*

* Lingard's Tracts, p. 238.

This passage was not much regarded by me at the time when I first read it; and I never reverted to it, till my attention was recalled to these matters by my present correspondence with you. I then determined to investigate the grounds of a statement, which I was confident was unfounded, but which I never before had thought worth examining. I now proceed to give you the result of my enquiries. It will be found, that *not a single point*, whether affirmed, or insinuated, in the passage which I have cited from Dr. Lingard, (except your Church's admission of the final Decree of the Council,) *is there truly stated by him*.

First, Dr. Lingard is pleased to say of his alleged authority, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in order to give the greater weight to his testimony, that he was "*a Roman author of the same age*" with the Council. Now, so far is this from being the case, that the Tract of Anastasius, from which Dr. Lingard makes his quotation, is inscribed to Pope John VIII., who did not succeed to the Papal Chair till near a hundred years later.*

In the next place, Dr. Lingard is so good as

* The Council sate A. D. 787; John VIII. was elected Pope A. D. 873. vid. Baron. Ann.

to give us the testimony of Anastasius to this alleged fact, that “in the Acts and Canons of the Council much is contained to which the Roman Church would never impart its sanction; *quæ apud nos nec habentur, nec admittuntur.*” Now, viewing this representation in the most favourable light, it is exactly of that kind which a man of real veracity would scorn to make; but which one, who halted between the inclination to mis-state and the fear of being exposed in his dishonesty, might bring himself to fancy at once serviceable and safe.

The words of Anastasius (to which, by the way, Dr. Lingard with all his accuracy in citing authorities, gives us no further clue than the name of the author) occur in a very short “Preface to the Seventh Synod” (the second Nicene) interpreted and edited by him. He was, as his title denotes, the Pope’s librarian, and, by virtue of that office, had access to all the Papal records and monuments. He had translated the eighth General Council, and thought it, therefore, unfit, that the seventh should remain locked up either in the original, or in an existing translation which was so very bad, as to be hardly intelligible. In the course of his further observations, he says, as follows; “Sanè notandum est, quædam in hâc Synodo

“ *ex Apostolorum et Sextæ Universalis Synodi Canonibus* et Sententiis inveniri, quæ penes nos
“ *interpretata* nec habentur, nec admittuntur.”

This sentence contains the raw material, out of which Dr. Lingard has wrought a main part of his very ingenious statement. On comparing the two passages, it will be perceived, that much of what is most important in the original is loosely slurred over by Dr. Lingard, and, in particular, that the word *interpretata*, which could not be made to accord with his views, is actually struck out of the clause which he professes to cite verbatim. But in order to make the whole case better understood, I will beg leave to state the following facts connected with it.

Neither in the fifth, nor in the sixth General Councils, were any Canons set forth. To supply this defect, certain Prelates (some of whom had sate in the sixth Council) met in a Council, called, from its purpose, “Quinisextum;”^{*} they there set forth Canons, and said that these Canons had before been passed at the *sixth* General Council. This “Concilium Quinisextum,” not having been duly summoned, and its acts not having received the approbation of the Pope, was never acknowledged at Rome.

^{*} Πενθεκτη; fifth-sixth.

Nevertheless, the Greeks, as appears from what Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, says in the fourth Actio of the second Nicene Council, received these Canons as Canons of the sixth General Council.

The Latins were not so ready to own them by that name, nor, indeed, to give them any sanction whatever. But as the seventh General, or second Nicene Council, adopting some of these Canons, and thus giving to them the sanction of the Church, calls them Canons of the sixth General Council, Anastasius thinks it necessary to explain what must otherwise seem very strange to his Latin readers, and this he does in the passage cited above. "It is worthy of remark," says Anastasius, that "there are found in this Council some things from the Apostolic Canons, and from the *Canons* and Decisions of the *sixth General Council*, which are not contained in the documents of that Council which we have in our possession (penes nos), translated into Latin, (interpretata,*) nor are they admitted by us." He then speaks of both the Apostolic and the other Canons, and says, that John VIII. had now

* That this is his meaning, is made still plainer by what he says a little afterwards, *incognitæ quia nec interpretatæ*.

admitted all the Canons of all Popes, Fathers, and Councils, which had preceded him, provided they were not contrary to faith and morals. "Therefore," he adds, "the Rules which the Greeks say were set forth by the sixth Council, the See of Rome admits in such manner in this seventh Council, that still those of them which contradict former canons or decrees of Popes, or sound morals, are in no measure received:"* but it is manifest, that those which are admitted by the seventh Council, and have thus the authority of the Church given to them, are not in the rejected class; nor, indeed, till this bold attempt of Dr. Lingard, were they ever pretended to be.

Does this sufficiently establish the unfairness of this writer, his intentional garbling, his gross misrepresentation of the passage which he cites? will it be contended, that he has erred through inadvertence, or in ignorance? This can hardly be believed: for neither inadvertence, nor ignorance, can account for the omission of a

* "Ergo regulas, quas Græci a sextâ synodo perhibent editas, ita in hâc synodo principalis Sedes admittit, ut nullatenus ex his illæ recipiantur, quæ prioribus canonibus vel decretis sanctorum Sedis hujus pontificum, aut certè bonis moribus inveniuntur adversæ." Labbe, Concil. t. vii. p. 30.

part of the words of his author, so important, that the sense of the passage is wholly subverted by the omission.

But I pass to another part of the case. Dr. Lingard directly affirms, that “the *Acts* of this Council,” as contradistinguished from “the doctrinal decree passed in the last session,” *are of no authority in the Catholic Church.*” I defy him to produce evidence of this assertion. Meanwhile, not only does the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as we have already seen, recognise those acts; but Bellarmine, in his book “*de Conciliis*,” reckons the second Nicene Council as the seventh of those “eighteen of which there is not one, that is not approved by the Pope, and received by Catholics;”* and this extends to the whole of the Acts of these eighteen, not to any particulars only: for he next specifies in a different class those which are “partly confirmed, partly rejected,”† as the Council of Constance, a part only of whose sessions is accepted, and the “*Concilium Quinisextum*,” whose Canons, though the Pope was not present at it either in person, or by his Legates, are “partly approved, because they have afterwards had

* Bellarm. *de Concil.* c. 5.

† *Ib.* c. 7.

“ the approbation of the Pope, or of other law-
 “ ful Councils, such, for instance, as *its eighty-*
 “ *second Canon ‘ de pingendis Imaginibus,’ which*
 “ *was received by Pope Adrian and the seventh*
 “ *Synod (the second Nicene), as appears from that*
 “ *very Synod, Act two and four.*”

Thus does your greatest and most learned divine recognise the authority of these acts of the second Nicene Council, as a matter of course. Indeed, he elsewhere says, “ Si ergò
 “ ullum est Concilium generale legitimum, certè
 “ hoc est;” a declaration of no trifling importance to my argument, not only as against Dr. Lingard, but also as fixing on your Church the full responsibility for all this Council’s proceedings.

But Dr. Lingard’s delinquencies do not end here. He insinuates (and an honest man ought to feel, that to insinuate what is untrue is as bad as to affirm it)—Dr. Lingard, I say, insinuates, that *only* “ the doctrinal decree passed
 “ in the last session,” *not the acts* of this Council at its other sessions, “ was approved by the
 “ Popes.”

This is as utterly unfounded as the rest. It is true, we learn from Bellarmine, that it had

* De Imag. l. ii. p. 806.

been asserted in the very age of the Council, that it had not the approbation of the Pope; but this assertion extended to the whole of the Council's proceedings, including its final decree; it would, therefore, if true, prove too much for Dr. Lingard's purpose;—nay, it went further; for it was accompanied with a charge against the Council of maintaining a doctrine, the very contrary to what is declared in that final decree, namely, that Latria is due to Images. How, therefore, does Bellarmine treat these averments? These are his words: “*Verè mendacia esse, et quòd Synodus Nicæna caruerit Papæ Auctoritate, et quòd decreverit imagines adorandas cultu latriæ, certissimum est.*” “For,” says he, “in this very Council, Act 2, are recited the letters of Adrian in favour of Images, and in all the Acts the Legates of Rome are the first who subscribe their names.”*

Lastly, *there is actually stronger and more particular evidence of the approbation of the Pope having been given to the Acts of this Council, than to those of any other Council whatsoever.* For, in the very volume† from which Dr. Lingard cites his passage from Anastasius, there is a

* Bellarm. de Imag. l. ii. p. 806. † Labb. Concil. t. vii.

long *defence of the Acts of the Council*, extending to particulars which occur in every one of the Acts separately, addressed to Charlemagne by the very *Pope Adrian I.*, who by his Legates presided at it.

I have here done with Dr. Lingard; and am sorry that I have been obliged to detain you so long with this discussion respecting him; a discussion which, I fear, not even the interest excited in you for the reputation of a friend, can have wholly prevented from being tedious. Perhaps, however, you will by this time understand, why I now attend “not to what Dr. Lingard may say, but to what he may prove:” and that to a history by that writer I do not attend at all.

Let us pass to something else.

LETTER V.

*Of Purgatory.—Doctrine of the Council of Trent.—
Trent Catechism.—Council of Florence.—Bellarmine.
—Histories respecting Purgatory.*

OF Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead you express your intention of saying little, because “you are not writing a work of controversy.” You therefore content yourself with citing a part of the decree of the Council of Trent, “that there is a purgatory, and that the souls “detained in it are helped by the suffrages of “the faithful;” and what you are pleased to call an explanation of “the nature and extent “of these suffrages by Saint Augustine.”*

Now, Sir, as you have undertaken to “state “the doctrine of your Church, though in the “shortest manner possible, on these heads,”† I must profess my disappointment, that you consider yourself as having redeemed your pledge by the extremely brief information contained in the words quoted above. I am aware,

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 104.

† Page 99.

that Dr. Milner says,* that “all which is necessary to be believed” by Roman-Catholics is contained in your statement,—that “there are only two points defined by your Church, namely, that there is a middle state which you call Purgatory,” and that “the Souls detained in it are helped by the prayers of the living faithful.” But whatever you and he may think necessary to be believed, I must take the liberty of saying, that much more is actually required by the Church of Rome; and this I shall proceed to prove from authorities, to which you have yourself referred.

I will begin with endeavouring to set in a clearer light the passage of the Council of Trent which is made the ground of your and Dr. Milner’s statement. For you really have no right to say, (as you do by implication, and Dr. Milner in express terms,) that that passage contains all which your Church has defined on this subject. The words of that passage itself, faithfully quoted, will be found to look to other things. Its real purport is as follows; “since the Catholic Church, instructed by Scripture, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers,† hath

* End of Controversy, p. 311 and 313.

† Qualis et seq. Dist. xxv.

“ taught in sacred Councils, and most recently
 “ in this general Council,* that there is a Purga-
 “ tory,† and that the Souls detained there are
 “ helped by the suffrages of the faithful, espe-
 “ cially by the sacrifice of the altar; the holy
 “ Council enjoins the Bishops to take diligent
 “ care that *the sound doctrine on the subject of Pur-*
 “ *gatory taught by the holy Fathers and sacred*
 “ *Councils* be believed by the faithful, be held,
 “ taught, and every where preached.”‡

Now what is “ the sound doctrine ” here alluded to, “ taught by the holy Fathers, and “ sacred Councils ”? In answering this question I will pursue the following method: I will state what is defined, first respecting Purgatory itself; secondly, respecting the persons detained in it; and thirdly, respecting the reasons for which they are detained. Having done this, I will look for confirmation of my statement and for more particular information to that divine, who is proclaimed by Dr. Milner to be “ your “ great Controvertist,” pre-eminent, even to a

* Sess. xxii. cap. 2. and can. 3. † Sess. vi. can. 30.

‡ Sess. xxv. The more difficult and subtle questions, and those which lead not to edification, the uncertain points and those which are suspected of being false, are not to be published to the multitude, and those which savour of base lucre are to be altogether prohibited.

proverb, for the “depth of his learning, and “the strength of his argument,” still more for his “preciseness;”^{*} and who is accordingly quoted by him[†] as authority for explaining the doctrines of your Church respecting Indulgences;—I mean, Cardinal Bellarmine. To him I say, I shall refer, as an undeniable evidence of what was considered at Rome, in the very age in which the Council sate, and after it had passed its decree respecting Purgatory, to be the sound doctrine which the Council required to be taught on this subject.

First, then, *Purgatory* is declared by the Catechism[‡] of the Council of Trent, (and consequently by the Council itself,) to be a *place*, not merely a state, of suffering,—not merely, therefore, of internal suffering, from the consciousness of having offended against the laws of God,—nor “*pœna damni*,” as has been maintained by some,—but also of external inflictions. The same Catechism also tells us, that it is (what Dr. Milner nevertheless says your Church does not require to be believed§) a Fire, “*ignis purgatorius*,” so called to distinguish it from the eternal Fire or Gehenna, the place of punish-

* Page 261. † P. 306.

‡ Cat. Rom. p. i. de art. vi. c. 6. 13.

§ At least not a “*material fire*.” End of Controversy, p. 313.

ment of damned spirits. And so important an article of faith does the Catechism regard it, that the Clergy are there particularly enjoined to be the more diligent and frequent in enforcing its truth, “ confirmed as it is by the Fathers “ and Apostolic tradition,”—“ because we have “ fallen on times in which Men do not endure “ sound doctrine.” For the intensity of the pains of this fire we are referred to an authority in the margin of the Council’s decree at the word “ Fathers,” I mean the Canon Law (Dist. 25, *qualis et seq.*) which says that “ this Fire, “ though not eternal, is yet painful in a wondrous degree: It surpasses every punishment “ which any one ever suffered in this life.”—Such is Purgatory itself.

In the second place, of the Souls of those confined and “ tortured for a definite period” in this dreadful fire, the Catechism declares, that they are *Souls of pious men*, “ *piorum animæ* :” the Council itself states that they are Souls of *truly penitent and justified Sinners* ;* and an equally high authority, the general Council of Florence, in its final doctrinal decree, pronounces them to be souls of “ *those who, having “ truly repented, die in the love of God.*”†

* Sess. vi. c. 30.

† Labbe, Concil. tom. xiii.

But not all pious Souls,—not all truly penitent and justified Sinners,—not all who die in the love of God,—but by far the greatest part of them; those, in short, (and this answers our third inquiry, *why* they are thus tormented,) who have “not satisfied by ‘works worthy ‘of repentance’ for their sins, whether of ‘commission or of omission,” incurred after Baptism.

For it is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, (as my Protestant readers may need to be informed,) that although in Baptism all Sin previously committed is freely forgiven, and all punishment on account of it, temporal as well as eternal, is fully remitted, yet after Baptism, mortal Sins are not dealt with so leniently; even when they have been remitted in the Sacrament of Penance, and so the guilt of them (*reatus culpæ*), and the eternal punishment in Hell on account of them, have been removed. In short, there still remains due to divine justice a temporary punishment: and those who have not satisfied for this temporary punishment by their works, or their sufferings, in this life, must suffer for them in Purgatory after death. And so necessary an article of faith is this held to be, that an Anathema is expressly denounced

by the Council of Trent against all who shall deny it.*

Nor are they only the more grievous, or (as your Church calls them) mortal Sins, which bring such tremendous consequences. We have the authority of the same passage of the Canon Law, to which, I repeat, we are referred in the margin of the Council of Trent's decree, for asserting, that venial Sins also, if not purged in this Life, are to be thus visited in Purgatory. The title of the article is, "What are the venial Sins, which are purged after this Life?" And in the article itself it is said, that this must be understood of "small, nay the very smallest offences, as, for instance, 'continual and idle talking, immoderate laughter, or want of care in managing one's affairs;† these things even after death are heavy upon us, if they have not been remitted while we live.'†

After this, can any one be so unreasonable, you may ask, as to charge your Church with too great lenity towards sin, when even the

* Sess. vi. c. 30.

† Hoc de parvis minimisque peccatis fieri posse credendum est, sicut est, assiduus et otiosus sermo, immoderatus risus, peccatum curæ familiaris, quod vix sine culpâ vel ab ipsis qui culpam qualiter declinare debeant, sciunt quæ etiam post mortem gravant. Dist. 25. ubi supra.

smallest errors are declared by it to be so big with future misery? But before I answer this question, I will fulfil my promise of giving briefly Cardinal Bellarmine's exposition of your Church's doctrine of Purgatory, (avoiding, however, the more subtle questions which he treats*) in confirmation of my statement.

He defines Purgatory to be a certain place, where, as in a prison, those Souls are purified after this Life, which were not purified here, in order that they may be able to enter into Heaven.† It is appointed, he says, for those who die *with venial Sins*, and again for those who die with the *reatus pœnæ*, (temporary punishment undischarged,) though the Sins themselves have been remitted.‡ The pains of Purgatory are most horrible, atrocissimæ, such as exceed, beyond all comparison, any sufferings upon earth; and that they are so, is the uniform doctrine of the Fathers.§ The belief of Purgatory is an article of Faith; so that “they who do not “believe it, shall never arrive there, but must “be tormented in the eternal fire of Hell.”||

* Such as, whether the fire be corporeal, l. 2. c. 11; and, if it be, how such a fire can burn souls; 12, whether the sufferers, are tormented by Dæmons, 13.

† Bell. de Purg. l. 1. c. 1.

§ L. 1. c. 14.

‡ L. 2. c. 1.

|| C. 15.

In proof of this doctrine of the Church, especially of the dreadful intensity and duration of the pains of Purgatory, he refers to visions, and other revelations made to saints; one or two of which, exhibited by him in another work,* I will here beg leave to cite: for narratives of this sort, proceeding from so high authority, are the best comments on your creed, and afford the most satisfactory illustrations of the belief which has actually prevailed in your Church.

“ Since many persons,” says Bellarmine, “ will not believe what they have never seen,” Purgatory more especially, “ it has pleased God sometimes to raise his servants from the dead, and to send them to announce to the living what they have really beheld.” Here it is obvious to remark, how much more gracious God is represented to have been to your Church on this particular, than might have been expected from his declaration in the Gospel, “ if they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.” It may indeed be said, and I am ready to admit the whole force of the suggestion, that neither “ Moses and the Pro-

* De Gemitu Columbæ, lib. 2. c. 9.

“ phets,” nor Christ and his Apostles, have said a single word about Purgatory, and therefore any especial revelation in proof of it was by no means superfluous. But this by the way.

Bellarmino's first narrative is taken out of the History of Venerable Bede, who was well acquainted with the case—it happened, indeed, in his own time and neighbourhood, and, as it well might be, was the common subject of amazement to all around him. ‘ A pious father of a family, in Northumberland, died, after a long illness, in the early part of one night, but, to the great terror of those who watched by his body, came to life again at the dawn of the following day. All, but his faithful and affectionate wife, fled at the sight of him; and to her he communicated, in the most soothing terms, the peculiar circumstances of his case; that he had, indeed, been dead, but was permitted to live again upon earth, though by no means in the same manner as before. In short, he sold all his property, divided the produce equally between his wife, his children, and the poor, and then retired to the monastery of Melrose. He there lived in such a state of unexampled mortification, as made it quite evident, even if he had not said a word on the subject, that he had seen things, whatever was the nature of them,

“ which no one else had been permitted to behold.’ But he disclosed it all :—“ One,” said he, “ whose aspect was as of light, and his garment glistening, conducted me to a valley of great depth and width, but of immeasurable length ; one side of which was dreadful beyond expression for its burning heat, and the other as horrible for its no less intolerable cold. Both were filled with the souls of men, which seemed to be tost, as by the fury of a tempest, from one side to the other : for, being quite unable to endure the heat on the right hand, the miserable wretches kept throwing themselves to the opposite side, into the equal torment of cold, and thence back again into the raging flames. This, thought I to myself, must be Hell ; but my guide answered to my thought, that it was not so—“ ‘ this valley,” says he, ‘ is the place of torment for the souls of those who, after delaying to confess and expiate their sins, have at length, in articulo mortis, had recourse to penance, and so have died. These, at the day of judgment, will all be admitted into the kingdom of Heaven, by reason of their confession and penance, late as it was. But, meanwhile, many of them may be as-

“ ‘sisted, and liberated before that day, by the
 “ ‘prayers, alms and fastings of the living, par-
 “ ‘ticularly by the sacrifice of the Mass.’ ”

This narrative is stated by Bellarmine to have his full belief, not merely on account of the veracity of Bede, but also from the edifying nature of the History itself. But he proceeds to one of much higher pretensions, to a narrative of St. Christina, which occurs in her Life written by Thomas Cantipratensis—“an author of the highest credit, and contemporary with the Saint—confirmed too, by the testimony of the pious and learned Cardinal James de Vitriaco, in the preface to his book of the Life and Acts of St. Mary de Oegnies.”

The following are the words spoken by St. Christina herself, immediately after her return to life, in the presence of many witnesses: (St. Christina, by the way, has her place in the Roman Calendar, and a festival is appointed to her honour on the 23d July. That she well merited this distinction will be apparent from the following narrative, the nature of which must have secured the closest scrutiny into its truth, during the process before her canonization, which could not, as you assure us, have been finally awarded without “the most solemn

“and strict proofs that miracles were worked by her, or through her intercession.”*)

“Immediately as I departed from the body,” says Christina, “my soul was received by ministers of light and angels of God, and conducted to a dark and horrid place filled with the souls of men. The torments which I there witnessed are so dreadful, that to attempt to describe them would be utterly in vain; and there I beheld not a few who had been known to me while they were alive. Greatly concerned for their hapless state, I asked what place it was, thinking it was Hell; but I was told that it was Purgatory, where are kept those who in their life had repented indeed of their sins, but had not paid the punishment due for them. I was next taken to see the torments of Hell, where also I recognized some of my former acquaintance upon earth.

“Afterwards I was translated to Paradise,

* Book, &c. p. 280. While these sheets were passing through the press, I have met with the Bull of Canonization of St. Francis de Paula (Bullar. Mag. t. i. p. 604.) and I find that two of the miracles proved by these “solemn and strict proofs,” in his case, were, his *boiling beans for dinner, in cold water, without fire*, and *lighting a lamp in a church without fire*.

“ even to the throne of the Divine Majesty ;
“ and when I saw the Lord congratulating me,
“ I was beyond measure rejoiced, concluding,
“ of course, that I should henceforward dwell
“ with him for evermore. But he presently said
“ to me, ‘ In very deed, my sweetest daughter,
“ ‘ here you shall be with me ; but for the pre-
“ ‘ sent I offer you your choice. Will you stay
“ ‘ for ever with me now ? or will you return
“ ‘ to the earth, and there in your mortal body,
“ ‘ but without any detriment to it, endure
“ ‘ punishments, by which you may deliver out
“ ‘ of Purgatory all those souls whom you so
“ ‘ much pitied, and may also, by the sight of
“ ‘ your penance, and the example of your life,
“ ‘ be a means of converting to me some who
“ ‘ are yet alive in the body, and so come
“ ‘ again to me at last with a great increase of
“ ‘ your merits?’ I accepted, without hesitation,
“ the return to life on the condition proposed ;
“ and the Lord, congratulating me on the
“ promptitude of my obedience, ordered that
“ my body should be restored to me. And here
“ I had an opportunity of admiring the incredi-
“ ble celerity of the blessed spirits ; for in that
“ very hour, having been placed before the
“ throne of God at the first recital of the Agnus
“ Dei, in the Mass which was said for me, at

“ the third my body was restored. This is an
 “ account of my death and my return to life. I
 “ am recalled to life for the correction and
 “ emendation of men ; I entreat you, therefore,
 “ not to be disturbed at what shall happen to
 “ me. I say this, because the things, which
 “ you shall see wrought in me by the will of
 “ God, will far exceed human comprehension.”

‘ These were her own words. The author of
 ‘ her Life adds, that she walked into burning
 ‘ ovens, and though she was so tortured by the
 ‘ flames that her anguish extorted from her the
 ‘ most horrible cries, yet, when she came out,
 ‘ there was not a trace of any burning to be
 ‘ detected on her body. Again, during a hard
 ‘ frost, she would go and place herself under
 ‘ the frozen surface of a river for six days, and
 ‘ more, at a time. Sometimes she would be
 ‘ carried round by the wheel of a water-mill,
 ‘ with the water of the river, and after having
 ‘ been whirled round in a horrible manner, she
 ‘ was as whole in body as if nothing had hap-
 ‘ pened to her—not a limb was hurt. At other
 ‘ times she would make all the dogs in the
 ‘ town fall upon her, and would run before
 ‘ them like a hunted beast ; and yet, in spite of
 ‘ being torn by thorns and brambles, and wor-
 ‘ ried and lacerated by the dogs, to such a de-

‘gree that no part of her body escaped without
‘wounds, there was not a weal nor a scar to be
‘seen.’

‘Such,’ says Bellarmine, ‘is the narrative of
‘Thomas Cantipratensis; and that he said no-
‘thing but the truth is evident, not only from
‘the confirmation given to his testimony by the
‘Bishop and Cardinal de Vitriaco, and from his
‘only telling what happened in the very pro-
‘vince in which he was a bishop, but because
‘the thing spoke for itself. It was quite plain
‘that the body must have been endued with
‘a divine virtue, which could endure all that
‘hers endured, without being damaged, and
‘this not for a few days, but for forty-two
‘years, during which she continued alive after
‘her resurrection; but still more manifest does
‘this become from the many sinners whom she
‘brought to penitence, and from the miracles
‘after her death by which she was distin-
‘guished. For God determined to stop the
‘mouths of all unbelievers.’

One instance more he gives, in proof of the possible duration of the pains of Purgatory even to the day of judgment. He quotes from the Life of St. Ludgardis, written by the same author as that of St. Christina. “About this
“time Innocent III., after having held the La-

“ teran Council, departed out of this life, and
“ shortly afterwards appeared to Ludgardis.
“ She, as soon as she beheld him encircled with
“ a vast flame, demanded who he was, and, on
“ his answering that he was Pope Innocent,
“ exclaimed with a groan, ‘ what can this be?
“ ‘ how is it that the common Father of us all is
“ ‘ thus tormented,’ &c.? ‘ The reasons of my
“ ‘ suffering thus,’ he answered, ‘ are three in
“ ‘ number, and they would have consigned me
“ ‘ to eternal punishments, had I not, through
“ ‘ the intercession of the most pious Mother of
“ ‘ God, to whom I founded a monastery, re-
“ ‘ pented when in extremis. As it is, though
“ ‘ I am spared eternal suffering, yet I shall
“ ‘ be tortured in the most horrible manner
“ ‘ to the day of judgment; and that I am
“ ‘ now permitted to come and pray for your
“ ‘ suffrages, is a boon which the Mother of
“ ‘ Mercy has obtained for me from her Son.’
“ With these words he disappeared. Ludgardis
“ not only communicated to her holy sisters
“ the sad necessity to which the Pope was re-
“ duced, in order to obtain their succour, but
“ she also herself submitted to astonishing tor-
“ ments on his account. The reader,” adds our
author, “ must understand, that Ludgardis her-
“ self revealed to me the three causes of the

“Pope’s sufferings; but I forbear to disclose them, out of reverence to so great a Pontiff.”

‘This instance’ (such is the pious comment of Bellarmine) ‘always affects me with the greatest terror. For if a Pontiff, entitled to so much praise, one who, to all human observation, was not merely a man of integrity and prudence, but of eminent, nay most exemplary, sanctity—if even he so narrowly escaped Hell, and, as it is, must suffer the most excruciating torments till the day of judgment—what prelate is there who does not tremble? who does not scrutinize the secrets of his own conscience with the most unsparing rigour? For I cannot easily persuade myself, that so great a Pontiff could have been capable of committing deadly sins, unless he were deceived, under some semblance of good by flatterers and relatives, of whom the Gospel says, “a man’s foes shall be they of his own household.”’

Perhaps the good Cardinal may have been in part influenced to make this last observation by his own experience of the mischief done at the Court of Rome by the flatterers who infested it; for it is well known that he was himself in bad odour there, for not carrying the doctrine of the Papal power quite high enough to satisfy

his superiors, though he has gone so far as to make all subsequent generations stare in terror or amazement.

But to return to Purgatory. After the alarming histories given above, can any persist to tax your Church with being too indulgent to human infirmity? Is it not, on the contrary, plain that her doctrine is more full of terrors than any other system whatsoever?

Happily, this is not the whole of her doctrine; there are some crumbs of comfort to which we will in the next place direct our attention.

LETTER VI.

Mr. Butler's statement of the means of relieving those who are detained in Purgatory.—His citation from Augustine on this subject.—Dr. Milner's citations from Augustine—Mr. Butler's from Calvin.

THE means of relieving the souls of the faithful, who are tormented in Purgatory, are thus briefly stated by you, after the Decree of the Council of Trent:—"The souls detained in Purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful"; and you proceed to say, that "the nature and extent of these suffrages are thus explained by St. Augustine. 'When the sacrifice of the altar, or alms, are offered for the dead, then, in regard to those whose lives were very good, such sacrifices may be deemed acts of thanksgiving. In regard to the imperfect, they may be deemed acts of propitiation; though they bring no aid to the very bad, they may give some comfort to the living.'"

Now, on this passage, you must forgive my remarking, that it appears to me singularly ill-fitted to the purpose for which you profess

to adduce it. If, indeed, you only wish to throw dust in the eyes of your readers, to have the appearance of saying something, while, in fact, nothing, or almost nothing, is really said,—above all, if you wish to cover an awkward tenet with the mantle of authority, and to obtain for it the seeming sanction of Augustine, to any or all of these purposes the passage may be exceeding well adapted. But as an explanation of the matter in question, it is only ludicrous. Two of the three cases supposed in it, the first and the last, those of the very good, and of the very bad, have absolutely nothing whatever to do with the subject: while the application of these suffrages to the remaining case, that of the *imperfect*, is as little explicit as can be devised.

But after all, Sir, what will you say when I tell you, that you have not the smallest right whatsoever to claim *any* service from this passage of Augustine? I hope this intimation will give you some surprise: it must do so, if you are as honest in these matters as I wish to consider you; if, in short, you have taken Augustine's supposed testimony, without examining it, at second hand. But I must plainly tell you, that whoever has knowingly given to this passage the form in which you now adduce it,

has been guilty of an artifice little short of forgery.

I have shewn, that, even as it stands, only one of the three cases exhibited in it will in any way apply to the question we are upon: and I have now to state, that this one apparently applicable case is produced by what may appear at first sight a trifling alteration, but will be found, in truth, a very material one, —I mean the substitution of the term *imperfect* for *non valdè malis*. You know quite well, Sir, that the Souls alleged to be detained in *Purgatory* are the Souls, as has been shewn, of *pious* men, of *the truly penitent*, of those who have died *in the love of God*, though they have not done all that was necessary in bringing forth fruits meet for repentance. Now, these may be very fitly designated by your term *imperfect*, and therefore it has been adopted; but they will not admit of Augustine's phrase *non valdè malis*, and, therefore, it has been rejected. The mere exhibiting of it must, you well know, have at once put you out of Court.

The truth is, that the real words of Augustine, though a most undeniable evidence in favour of Sacrifices of the Altar, and of Alms for the Dead, are a strong *tetisimony against* the Roman doctrine of *Purgatory*. On examining

them with their context, particularly with the words which immediately precede and immediately follow them, it is plain, that the author contemplated the day of Judgment, as the time when the dead would be benefited by these pious services offered for them by their surviving friends. For this is the course of his argument: ‘ Let not any one suppose that this notion of being assisted after death by the pious offices of surviving friends is contrary to the text of St. Paul, “ We shall all stand before the *Judgment Seat of Christ*, that he may render to every one according to the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad ;” since it is by the conduct of a man while in the body that he has procured to himself the ability of deriving benefit from those offices of others. For it is the difference of men’s conduct in life, which makes it possible, or impossible, for them to be thus benefited. When, therefore, the Sacrifices of the Altar, or Alms, are offered for the dead, then, in regard to those whose lives are very good, such sacrifices may be deemed acts of thanksgiving: in regard to those who are not *very bad*, they may be deemed acts of propitiation: in the case of the absolutely bad, though they afford no aid to such, they may give some comfort to the living. But they who

‘are benefited by them, (the non valdè mali) are benefited to this end, that their pardon be complete, or *their very damnation* be made more tolerable.’* And the succeeding chapters shew, that this damnation is that which will be awarded at the general Resurrection.†

So much for your citation from Augustine. I am aware, that Dr. Milner has referred to this same passage;‡ but as he has not quoted it in words, I do not charge him with the same unfairness which must be ascribed to the production of it in the form it wears in your book. But it is more difficult to acquit him of unfairness of another kind, the extreme unfairness of affecting to discover in this passage, and others in the same tract, a testimony which he can hardly fail to know is not that, which on due consideration must be drawn from them. I say this, because the same plea will not be admitted

* Quibus autem prosunt, ad hoc prosunt, ut sit plena remissio, aut certè tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio. Ench. 110.

† This is also shewn by chapter 93, where there is a remarkable similarity even of expression. Speaking of the general Resurrection, he says, Mitissima sanè omnium pœna erit eorum, qui præter peccatum quod originale traxerunt, nullum insuper addiderunt : et in cæteris qui addiderunt, tantò quisque *tolerabiliorem ibi habebit damnationem*, quantò hic minorem habuit iniquitatem.

‡ P. 312.

for him, of which I am desirous of giving you the full benefit; he cannot be supposed to have taken the alleged testimony on the credit of another. He, a professed controvertist, and champion of your Church, must have examined these matters for himself; particularly, before he permitted himself to found on them a charge of falsehood against a venerable prelate* now no more, for declaring “that Purgatory, *in the present Popish Sense*, was not heard of for 400 years after Christ.”

Of the passages cited by Dr. Milner from this tract of Augustine, in justification of his most indecent charge, one has been already considered; the other† merely states, that “during the interval between death and the general Resurrection, departed Souls are kept in hidden receptacles, according as every one is worthy of rest or pain: nor is it to be denied, that their sins are relieved by the piety of their living friends.” Here are two places, or conditions, of rest for good souls, and of pain for the evil; but no intimation of a third, no “Purgatory in the present Popish Sense,” as the bishop expresses it.

The truth is, that Dr. Milner has only en-

* Bishop Porteus—See End of Controversy, p. 311.

† c. 109.

grafted a little of his own peculiar rhetoric on the old and established practice of writers in your communion, who are always anxious to couple Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead together, as if the latter necessarily implied the former. But prayer for the Dead, in the early ages of the Church, proceeded on very different grounds. One of them I shall have occasion to mention presently : meanwhile, I content myself with saying, that, in Augustine, passages, which prove the practice of Prayer for the Dead, are in general found in company with others, which negative a belief in Purgatory, never (as far as I have seen, or Dr. Milner has shewn) with any which affirm it. In particular, the tract, with which we are at present engaged, is full of passages opposite to the purpose for which it is cited by you and Dr. Milner. In it the very text,* of which he affects triumphantly to ask “ what other sense “ it can bear than that which makes it ‘ a proof

* 1 Cor. iii. 12—15. “ If any man build upon this foundation (Jesus Christ) gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble ; every man’s work shall be made manifest : for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire ; and *the fire shall try every man’s work* of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss : but he himself shall be saved ; yet so as by fire.”

“ ‘ of Purgatory,’ ” is explained, in a meaning wholly unconnected with that tenet. For Augustine* interprets the fire mentioned by St. Paul as the fire of tribulation or persecution in this life, (“ est quidem iste ignis tentatio tribulationis,”) and applies it as follows: “ They, whose foundation is Christ, though they build not thereupon; as they ought, ‘ gold, silver, precious stones,’ (that is, heavenly affections and desires) but ‘ wood, hay, stubble,’ the desires of things of this world, over which the fire of tribulation will have power to consume and destroy them, if, nevertheless, they still keep the foundation, if, however they may themselves burn with grief for the loss of the objects of their earthly affections, they would still rather lose them all, than abandon Christ,—these are saved, but so as by fire.”

He then proceeds in a manner seemingly more favourable to your doctrine. “ It is not “ incredible that some such thing as this may “ take place after this life also; and this may be “ a subject of enquiry, whether this be so, or “ not. It† may be found, or it may not, that

* Ench. c. 66.

† Utrum ita sit, quæri potest, et aut inveniri aut latere non-nullos per ignem quendam purgatorium, &c. : the construction of inveniri aut latere is not very clear; but the general meaning of the passage is plain enough.

“ some men, through a certain purgatory fire
“ in proportion as they have more or less loved
“ the perishing enjoyments of the world, are
“ slower or sooner in attaining salvation.” But
even if this were the same as the Roman Purgatory, (it will soon be made apparent, that it is not,) is it conceivable, that any author, after speaking in this very doubtful manner of such a tenet (alluding to it only as *not incredible*) can have intended to affirm it, positively, in the course of the very same short treatise? If he did so in direct terms, would not his authority be utterly contemptible? and if he should seem to do so in terms admitting another construction, is it not quite clear, that any other is rather to be chosen?

I repeat, that it is not my intention to enter into controversy about the truth or falsehood of your doctrines; nor would I ordinarily trouble you or myself with observations on the value of the arguments adduced for them, whether from reason or authority; but having been thus drawn into an enquiry respecting the fairness of one citation from Augustine, and perceiving that Dr. Milner claims that father, generally, as a decisive authority in favour of Purgatory, I shall not scruple to extend my investigation to other instances, particularly to that which is

brought forward by him with most confidence, and has, in truth, the most promising appearance, I mean the passage from Augustine's Comment on the thirty-seventh (or rather thirty-eighth) Psalm: "Purify me, O Lord, in this life, that I may not need the chastising fire of those *who will be saved, yet so as by fire.*"

We have seen that on another occasion Augustine gives a very different interpretation of the text of St. Paul, to which he here refers; and I may add, that in a third place* he speaks of that text, as very "hard to be understood," as one even of those which St. Peter had thus characterized. But, in the present instance, he adopts a notion, which was, indeed, supported by others of the ancients, (not that "there is an intermediate state which you call Purgatory,"† but) that all men must at the day of Judgment pass through the fire of the final conflagration,—a notion grounded principally, or solely, on that very difficult text. That this was his meaning is not so plain from the passage itself, as from a comparison of it with two other passages in the same book. The verse, on which Augustine comments in the passage quoted by Dr. Milner, is that which stands as

* De Fide et Operibus, c. 15. † End of Controv. p. 312.

the first verse of the thirty-eighth Psalm in our Bible, "O Lord, rebuke me not in thy wrath, "neither chasten me in thy heavy displeasure." Now, in his comment on the same, or almost the same, words in the first verse of the sixth Psalm, he speaks of this rebuking, and consequently of this chastening (to which he applies the very same text of St. Paul) as taking place *at the day of Judgment*.* And this is said in still plainer terms in his comment on the 103d Psalm, v. 12. "That evening is the end of the "world, and that smoking furnace the day of "Judgment. If a man shall build upon the "foundation wood, hay, stubble, that is, shall "build worldly affections on his faith, still if his "foundation be Christ, if Christ have the first "place in his heart, and nothing be preferred "to him, the smoking furnace shall come and "burn up the wood, the hay, the stubble; "but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by "fire. This shall be the effect of the smoking "furnace; it shall separate some to the left "hand (the place of the damned) others it shall

* "Domine, ne irâ tuâ arguas me, nec in furore tuo corripias me." Arguuntur autem *in die judicii* omnes qui non habent fundamentum, quod est Christus: emendantur autem, id est purgantur, qui huic fundamento superædificant lignum, &c. Detrimentum enim patientur, sed salvi erunt tanquam per ignem.

“ in a certain manner refine away to the right
“ hand,” the station of the blessed. Let me
add, that this text of St. Paul (promising as
Dr. Milner may deem it) carries within it a de-
cisive proof that it is not applicable to the Ro-
man doctrine of Purgatory; for “ the fire” there
mentioned, “ shall try *every man’s* work,” which
is contrary to the first notion of Purgatory.
There is another work of Augustine, to which
Dr. Milner has had recourse, *De Civitate Dei*.
He cites the 21st book, ch. 24. to shew that some
sins are forgiven in the world to come. This is
a matter with which I shall not trouble myself;
but I beg leave to cite the 26th chapter of the
same book, to shew that of another notion,
which more nearly approached to the Roman
Purgatory, than any other that has been stated,
(though still by no means the same) the most
that Augustine can bring himself to say, is, that
he does not argue against it, because, *perhaps it
is true*;* I must likewise cite the 26th chapter
of the preceding book to shew that the purifying
fire really spoken of by Augustine, in this work
also, is not the Roman Purgatory, but *the fire
of the last Judgment*. “ In that fire, igne judicii
“ novissimi, shall men be cleansed, in order that

* Non redarguo, quia forsitan verum est. *De Civ. Dei*, l.
21. c. 26.

“they may offer sacrifices in righteousness;
 “for we must believe that after undergoing
 “the purification, the just will have no sin.”
 “For those sacrifices of the old law were com-
 “manded to be offered without spot, and sig-
 “nified holy men, such as Christ alone* has
 “been found to be, without any sin whatever.
 “Therefore, *after the judgment, when those shall*
 “*have been cleansed by the fire*, who are worthy
 “of that purification, there shall be found in all
 “the saints an entire freedom from all sin; and
 “thus they may offer themselves without spot.”

I have now examined Dr. Milner's citations from Augustine in a more detailed manner, than accords, perhaps, with my professed purpose. I have done so, I frankly avow, because there appears to me much more of disingenuousness, than of misapprehension, on his part: and I have the less scruple in declaring this my opinion, because the coarse and unfounded invective with which he has assailed Bishop Porteus,

* I cannot forbear to notice this distinct testimony of Augustine, thus thrown in our way, against the doctrine of the Roman Church, respecting the Virgin Mary—*solus inventus est Christus, sine ullo omnino peccato*; and lest any quibble be made respecting Original Sin, I will cite the following from the same chapter: *Excepto uno Mediatore, et post lacacrum regenerationis quibusque adhuc parvulis, nemo mundus a sorde, sicut scriptum est, nec infans cujus vita unius diei super terram.*

demands that he be not himself treated with too much forbearance. For asserting that “Purgatory, *in the present Popish sense*,” was not “heard of for 400 years after Christ; nor universally received for 1000 years; nor almost in any other Church than that of Rome to this day;”—that Prelate is accused by Dr. Milner of “*three egregious falsities*.” The sort of evidence adduced for this accusation, I have endeavoured to set forth; and I now conclude with quoting, on these same points, the language of one of the greatest divines, and most virtuous men, who ever adorned your Communion,—one, who bore a large share in the controversy against Luther, and, I need not add, sealed the testimony of his sincerity with his blood,—Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. You will perceive, that he, almost in direct terms, affirms those very propositions, which, coming from the pen of a Protestant Bishop, are treated by your modern Hierarch with such disgraceful scurrility.

“No orthodox person,” says he, “now doubts whether there be a purgatory; and yet by those ancients there was not any mention made of it whatever, or, if any, the rarest possible. Nay, by the Greeks, even to the present day, the very existence of

“ Purgatory is disbelieved. Let any one, who
 “ will, read the Commentaries of the Greek
 “ Fathers, and he will find, that they never, (if
 “ I mistake not,) or, at any rate, as seldom as
 “ possible, speak of Purgatory. Nor even did
 “ the Latins all at once receive this truth.”
 “ Since, then, *Purgatory was so late in being*
 “ *known and admitted* by the universal Church,
 “ can any man wonder, that of a practice con-
 “ nected with the belief of it, there was no
 “ instance to be found in the early ages of the
 “ Church?”*

This is the language of Bishop Fisher. Choose, Sir, between him and Dr. Milner. Choose, whether you will seek for your Church such advantages only, as can be obtained by fair and manly argument, or will prefer the specious, but in the end the ruinous, course, of aiming at a little temporary triumph by the artifices of the sophist or the calumniator. At present, I am sorry to say (while I wish to acquit you of calumny) that in sophistry you are too apt and forward a pupil of your great master. Hence it is, that you have ventured to eke out your meagre section on the question before us, with the following miserable attempt to mislead your readers. “ Tradi-

* Adv. Luther. art. 18.

“tion, in favour of the Catholic doctrine of
“Purgatory, is so strong, that Calvin confesses
“explicitly, that during 1300 years before his
“time, (1600 before ours) it had been the
“practice to pray for the dead, in the hope of
“procuring them relief.” You have not thought
fit to give any reference to the particular work
of Calvin, from which you make this notable
quotation; though you require of us to mention
always, “the work, the edition of it, and the
“page in which it is contained.”* Left, there-
fore, as we are, to hunt for the passage through
nine ponderous folios, I am so illiberal as to
suspect, either that it does not exist at all in
the precise form in which you exhibit it; or, if
it exists, that it would be found in company
which you would be very sorry it should be
seen to keep. Permit me to ask, Sir, whether
you ever read what Calvin has really written on
this point? if you have not, will you acknow-
ledge any obligation to me for informing you, in
that writer’s own words, what he thought and
taught on “Tradition in favour of Purgatory?”

“As to Purgatory, we know that there were
“ancient Churches which made mention of the
“dead in their prayers, but that was rare, was

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, &c. p. 10.

“sober, and contained in few words, such, in
 “short, as showed that they only wished to
 “testify incidentally their own charity towards
 “the dead. The architects, who built up that
 “Purgatory of yours, were not yet in exist-
 “ence.”—“I will not suffer, Sadoletus, that
 “the name of the Church be inscribed on such
 “flagitious tenets,—that you shall so defame
 “it, in violation of all that is just or sacred,—
 “and raise against us a prejudice in the minds
 “of the ignorant, as if we were resolved to
 “wage war with the Church.—For, while I
 “admit that there were sown long ago certain
 “seeds of superstition, which were somewhat
 “degenerating from the purity of the Gospel,
 “yet you know well, that the monstrous im-
 “pieties, against which our warfare is directed,
 “were but recently either first called into ex-
 “istence, or at least carried to their present
 “magnitude. Against your whole proud sys-
 “tem, to take it by storm, to trample it to the
 “earth, to scatter it to the winds, *we are armed*
 “not only with the strength of the divine word,
 “but also *with the authority of the holy Fathers.*”*

* Resp. ad Sadolet. p. 110. Since writing the above, I have found the passage (Inst. l. 3. c. 5. s. 10.) which you have had in view. It is what I suspected, as will be apparent from the following extracts. “Quum mihi *objiciunt adversarii, ante*

This, Sir, is an account of the Tradition respecting Purgatory given by Calvin, "that blasphemous Calvin," as he is called by the meek and holy Dr. Milner. Avail yourself of it if you can.

"mille et trecentos annos usu receptum fuisse, ut preces fierent pro defunctis, eos vicissim interrogo, quo Dei verbo &c. factum sit." "Cæterum ut concedam, vetustis Ecclesiæ scriptoribus pium esse visum suffragari mortuis," &c. "Verum ne gloriantur adversarii nostri, quasi veterem ecclesiam erroris sui sociam habeant, dico esse longum discrimen." "Agebant illi memoriam mortuorum, ne viderentur omnem de ipsorum curam abjecisse: sed simul fatebantur, se dubitare de ipsorum statu. De purgatorio certè adeo nihil assererent, ut pro re incertâ haberent." "Quinetiam nonnulla veterum testimonia proferre, nobis haud difficile esset, quæ totas illas pro mortuis preces, quæ tunc usitatæ erant, manifestè evertunt." —It is thus that Calvin "*confesses explicitly* that during 1300 years before his time (1600 before ours) it had been the practice to pray for the dead, *in the hope of procuring them relief*."

LETTER VII.

Means of relieving those who are confined in Purgatory stated in the Decree and the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

HITHERTO we have been unsuccessful in our search for those reliefs which the unhappy state of souls detained in Purgatory so urgently demands. Let us, however, turn from your and Dr. Milner's pages to other more authoritative quarters. We need not look far. The Council of Trent, in the very decree* from which you quote, gives us some pregnant intimations of the real nature of the help afforded to Souls in Purgatory by the suffrages of the faithful.

After explaining these suffrages to be "sacrifices of the mass, prayers, alms, and other works of piety," the Council tells us, that they may be, and are accustomed to be, performed by the living faithful on the behalf and in the place of the faithful dead.* This is said with sufficient plainness in the decree; but it is still more expressly declared in the Council's

* Sess. xxv.

Catechism, where the possibility of this vicarious satisfaction is affirmed for all, dead as well as living. “Herein is the most exalted goodness and clemency of God worthy of all praise and thanksgiving, that he has mercifully granted to the infirmity of the human race, that one man may be able to *satisfy* for another,”* to satisfy, that is, on account of another, for the temporal punishment either in this world or in Purgatory, which remains due for those mortal sins, whose guilt and eternal punishment are already remitted.—“And this,” the Catechism proceeds, “is peculiar to this part of Pœnitentia; for though no one can be *contrite* for another, or *confess* for another, yet those who are endowed with divine grace,” (as all after absolution are supposed to be,) “are able in the name of another to discharge fully what is due to God.”† And thus we have the comfort of seeing a method devised, by which the Souls in Purgatory may be effectually relieved. Their surviving friends may discharge for them the works worthy of repentance, which they omitted to perform for themselves before they died.

* Cat. ad Par. pars ii. cap. 5.

† Ibid. Qui divinâ gratiâ præditi sunt, alterius nomine possunt, quod Deo debetur, persolvere.

Not only so ; but some bolder expedients have been said to be occasionally adopted, I mean, that of playing at trictrac, or other games of chance or skill, for satisfactions as the stake ; where the loser, of course, must perform, for his successful opponent, such works as it has been his ill-luck to lose, and thereby to abridge for him the term of his future sufferings in Purgatory.—I have none but Protestant vouchers for this fact ; and therefore, in writing to you, I insist on it no farther, than by declaring most sincerely, that I see not how it is inconsistent with the doctrine taught by your Church, or what there is to prevent the practice, unless, as we may charitably hope, the feelings of your people are in this respect better than their principles.

But I turn to something of higher authority. The same decree of the Council of Trent recognizes a still more consolatory resource for Souls in Purgatory, than any voluntary substitution of satisfaction by friends. As these friends of the deceased may chance to be unmindful of them, or may have enough to do on their own account, a prudent Penitent, if he be also an opulent one, will take care, in contemplation of the pains of Purgatory, to make his testamentary dispositions in such a manner, as shall secure

the performance of an adequate number of masses for his relief. The Council, with laudable attention to the equity of these transactions, strictly enjoins, that the money shall not have been received, without a return of the money's worth: that "whatever shall be due for the faithful defunct, according to the foundations of testators, or on any other score, shall be discharged, not perfunctorily, but by the Priests, and Ministers of the Church, and others whom it may concern, with diligence and accuracy."*

Now here you have a most effectual way of making to yourselves friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness; and to do justice to the sons of your Church in former days, they were not slow or niggardly in making use of it. Of the extent, to which the practice was carried in our own country, we have a standing monument in the statutes of Mortmain, a timely, and, happily, a successful attempt, to close that "great gulph, in which," as Blackstone expresses it, "all the landed property of the kingdom was in danger of being swallowed."

* Sess. xxv. *Quæ pro illis (fidelibus defunctis) ex testatorum foundationibus vel aliâ ratione debentur, non perfunctoriè, sed a Sacerdotibus, et Ecclesiæ ministris, et aliis qui hoc præstare tenentur, diligentè et accuratè persolvantur.*

Some uncharitable persons may even suspect, that the appalling histories which Bellarmine has given us, of Saints Christina and Ludgar-dis, and other similar statements of the pains of Purgatory, accompanied as they all are with intimations of the benefit to be derived from the pious offices of the living, were originally designed to promote this holy traffic. In truth, how could the perishable goods of this world be better employed, than in purchasing these inestimable benefits beyond the grave? and what surviving relative could begrudge a curtailed inheritance, on such ample terms of benefit to the deceased? "Let us hear," then, "the conclusion of the whole matter." "How hardly shall he, who trusts in riches, enter into the kingdom of God," says the gospel of Christ Jesus. "How hardly shall he, who trusts in riches, be kept out of the kingdom of God!" says the gospel of the Church of Rome.* If it be

* For writing this I doubtless shall be charged with much illiberality. I cannot help it. After my critics shall have vented their indignation on me, I commend to their attention a passage from an "Encyclical Letter" of the present Pope, Leo XII. to the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops, of his Church, recently published, with an Address "to all the faithful clergy and people" in Ireland, subscribed by all the Roman-Catholic Archbishops, and Bishops, in that country.

one of the high distinctions of the former, that to the poor the gospel is preached, it may be not less the appropriate boast of the latter, that by it the case of the rich has been no less

In that address this Encyclical Letter, from which I am about to give an extract, is pronounced to be "replete with truth and wisdom;" that on receiving it the subscribing Prelates "at once recognized the voice of him, for whom our Redeemer "prayed that his faith might not fail, and to whose *ardent charity* he entrusted the care of his entire flock. We exclaimed, therefore," they continue, "with the Bishops of the "Catholic Church formerly assembled at Chalcedon, *Peter has spoken by Leo:*" In plain English that this Encyclical Letter breathes the true spirit of your Church. With this very satisfactory comment, I now produce my extract:—

"The wickedness of our foes has proceeded so far, that in "addition to a deluge of pernicious books, hostile to religion, "they endeavour to employ to its detriment the Sacred Scriptures, which were given to us by God for its support.

"You are aware, venerable brethren, that a society, commonly called *the Bible Society*, strolls with effrontery "throughout the world: which Society, contemning the traditions of the Holy Fathers, and contrary to the well known "decree of the Council of Trent, labours with all its might, "and by every means, to translate—or rather to pervert—the "Holy Bible into the vulgar languages of every nation; from "which proceeding, it is greatly to be feared that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages, may also "occur with regard to others; to wit: 'that, by a perverse "interpretation, *the Gospel of Christ be turned into a human Gospel, or, what is still worse, into the Gospel of the Devil.*' "

happily provided for. Charles II. had good reason for saying, that yours is the only religion for a gentleman.*

* It may be satisfactory to learn, that the poor in Ireland have lately had their piteous condition, in respect to posthumous suffering, taken into consideration, and societies are established for their relief; some of them chiefly supported by the weekly subscriptions of the poor themselves, who contribute according to their means, "5d. 2½d. or 1d. per week." To the same fund the contributions of the more opulent and charitable are invited, "at the rate of 7½d. 10d. or 1s. per week, given quarterly in advance, WHICH GRAND SUBSCRIPTIONS WILL BE FAITHFULLY REGISTERED AND TRANSMITTED FROM OUR BOOKS TO THE BOOKS OF ETERNAL LIFE, IN ORDER TO RECEIVE THE MORE AMPLE RECOMPENSE AND MORE GLORIOUS REWARDS." "*When a member dies, Masses will be immediately celebrated for the eternal repose of the soul, ACCORDING TO THE SUBSCRIPTION, on condition the deceased member has given at least a year's subscription and be a subscriber at death.*"

This is an extract of a paper pretty widely circulated in Dublin, and printed by J. Coyne, under the title "J. M. J." (*i. e.* Jesus, Mary, Joseph.) "Plan of a charitable Institution." The objects of this society are several.

Others are more strictly confined to the relief of souls in Purgatory, and are entitled "Purgatorian Societies;" one of them instituted March 29, 1806, and held at the Evening Free School, No. 43, Meath Street.

"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Among the rules of this society are the following; "R. 2. That every well-disposed Catholic wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in Purgatory shall pay 1d. per week, which shall be appropriated to the pro-

“curing of masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls
 “of the deceased parents, relations, and friends of all the
 “subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful
 “departed in general.” “R. 6. Each subscriber shall be
 “entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the
 “expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months
 “after their decease, also the benefit of masses which shall be
 “procured to be offered by the money arising from subscrip-
 “tions, and which shall be extended to their parents, relations,
 “&c.” “R. 7. Every member of the office for the dead, who
 “serves the society in the capacity of Superior, shall at the time
 “of his death be entitled to the benefit of three masses,
 “Rector, &c. two masses, and every subscriber without dis-
 “tinction shall be entitled to one mass, if he be six months a
 “subscriber, and be clear of all dues at the time of his depar-
 “ture.”

There is another similar society, UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
 ST. JOSEPH, of which the Rev. R. J. O'Hanson is President.

In the recent examination of Dr. Doyle, before the Com-
 mittee of the House of Lords, the existence of these Societies
 was not denied by him. The following are the questions pro-
 posed to Dr. Doyle on this subject, and his answers. See
 Report of Evidence, page 397.

Q. Are there any Purgatorian Societies in Dublin?

A. I am unacquainted with those Societies.

Q. They are not countenanced among the Bishops?

A. I am not acquainted with them at all; there may be
 various things *countenanced by poor tradesmen in Dublin*, of
 which I know nothing.



LETTER VIII.

Indulgences.

WE have not yet completed the catalogue of expedients for the comforts of those who can afford to pay for them. The subject of this letter presents us with a whole storehouse of mercies at the disposal of the Church. But before I advert to them, I must beg leave to pay a little attention to yourself and Dr. Milner. It is remarkable that both of you exhibit an excessive shyness in acknowledging the natural relation between the doctrine of Purgatory and Indulgences. Mr. Southey* has, as might be expected, treated them in connection with each other, as parent and offspring. But you, professing to “take *successively* into consideration the principal subjects “on which he criminales the Roman-Catholics “in his 10th chapter,”† make a most awkward separation between these two articles, and thrust in “Confession,” between them. And yet, after all, when you come to talk about

* Vol. i. p. 310.

† Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 99.

Indulgences you are compelled to recognize their close connection with Purgatory.

Dr. Milner takes a still bolder course. He does not, indeed, compel a direct separation between them, but he reverses their relation; and makes Indulgences precede Purgatory. Not only so, but he scolds Bishop Porteus in good round terms, telling him that “his ideas “are much confused,” and “his knowledge” of the subjects he is writing upon “very imperfect;”* in part, because he treats those subjects in their natural order. I must again call on old Bishop Fisher to protect his Protestant brother from the chastisement of this modern apostolic Vicar.† He does so in the same passage from which I quoted before. “As long,” says he, “as there was no care “about Purgatory, no one sought for Indulgences: for ‡*it is on Purgatory that all regard “for Indulgences depends. If you take away “Purgatory, for what will you want Indul-*

* End of Controversy, p. 302.

† It is proper to add that the *Tractatus de Pœnitentia*, by Delahogue, which is the Class-book at Maynooth College, presents these subjects in the same order as Bishops Fisher and Porteus.

‡ Fisher's Works (Johan. Roffen.) ubi supra. “Ex illo “pendet omnis indulgentiarum existimatio.”

“ gences ? we shall not have the smallest need
“ of them, if there be no Purgatory.” “ Since
“ then Purgatory was so late in being known
“ and received in the Church, *can any one won-*
“ *der respecting Indulgences, that there was no*
“ *use of them in the early ages of the Church ?*”
These concluding words I leave to Dr. Milner
to discuss, when he next announces, that “ the
“ Church has claimed and exercised the power”
of granting Indulgences, “ ever since the time
“ of the Apostles down to the present.”*
Meanwhile, he must forgive those who prefer
Bishop Fisher’s authority to his.

But what is the meaning of all this reluctance to own the connection between these two doctrines ? Is there any thing scandalous in it ? Dr. Milner appears to think so, as do several other of your Church’s modern advocates : and I am rendering to you only an act of justice, (which I do most cheerfully,) when I say, that your account of the doctrine of Indulgences is one of the fairest I have seen in the works of any of your modern writers. Many of your apologists prevaricate most sadly. For instance, Gother’s “ Papist “ misrepresented and represented,” says, that

* End of Controversy, p. 306.

Indulgences “are nothing else but a mitigation
 “or relaxation, upon just causes, of *canonical*
 “*penances*, which are, or may be enjoined by
 “the pastors of the Church, on penitent sin-
 “ners, according to their several degrees of
 “demerit.”*

Bossuet more largely says the very same; that
 “it is the necessity of satisfactory works which
 “has obliged the ancient Church to impose
 “penances called canonical: when, therefore,
 “she imposes on sinners painful and laborious
 “works, and they undergo them with humility;
 “that is satisfaction: and when, out of regard
 “to the fervour of the penitents, or to other
 “good works, which she prescribes to them,
 “she relaxes something of the punishment
 “which is due, that is called Indulgence.”†

Dr. Milner conducts this part of his case
 with even more than his usual skill. In confor-
 mity to his plan of keeping the connection of
 Purgatory and Indulgences, as much as possible,
 out of sight, he actually contrives, in a long
 and laboured and methodized explanation of
 the latter, to avoid even once naming the for-
 mer. He tells us, that “God (like every
 “sovereign Prince) may shew mercy to con-

* “8, of Indulgences.” † Exposition of Faith, s. 8.

“ demned sinners either by remitting to them
“ all punishment, or subjecting them to some
“ lighter one than that to which they are con-
“ demned ; that many instances occur in the
“ Bible of God’s remitting the essential guilt
“ of sin, and the eternal punishment due to it;
“ and yet leaving a temporary punishment still
“ to be endured : that this is, indeed, the com-
“ mon course of his mercy and wisdom in the
“ forgiveness of sins committed after baptism :
“ that the essential guilt and eternal punish-
“ ment of sin can only be expiated by the merits
“ of Christ, but a certain temporal punish-
“ ment is reserved for the penitent himself to
“ endure : that *satisfaction* for this temporal pu-
“ nishment has been instituted by Christ, as a
“ part of the sacrament of penance : neverthe-
“ less, that the jurisdiction of the Church ex-
“ tends to this very satisfaction, so as to be able
“ to remit it wholly or partially, in certain cir-
“ cumstances, by what is called an *Indulgence* :
“ that this power was exercised by St. Paul,
“ and has been claimed and exercised by the
“ Church from the time of the apostles. Still
“ it is not arbitrary ; there must be a just cause
“ for exercising it ; and there must be a *certain*
“ proportion between the punishment remitted
“ and the good work performed ; hence, no

“one can ever be sure that he has gained the
 “entire benefit of an Indulgence, though he
 “has performed all the conditions appointed
 “for this end: and, hence, the pastors of the
 “Church will have to answer for it, if they
 “take upon themselves to grant indulgences
 “for unworthy or insufficient purposes: Lastly,
 “*it is the received doctrine of the Church, that*
 “an Indulgence, when truly gained, *is not barely*
 “*a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by*
 “*the Church,* but also an actual remission by
 “God himself, of the whole or part of the tem-
 “poral punishment due to it in his sight.”*

Before I proceed further, let me briefly remark on the contradiction here given to Mr. Gother and Bossuet, and let me ask, which of them we are to believe. You send us to all three; Bossuet, in particular, has a great name and reputation in the world, and is ordinarily cited by the modern diluters of the doctrine of your Church as a decisive authority. In spite, however, of all that can be said for him, he, as well as Gother, is in this instance wrong. His statement is condemned in express terms by Leo X. (as will be seen presently,) and Pius VI.,† and, by implication, it is also condemned

* End of Controversy, p. 305—307.

† In Bullâ anni 1794.

by the Council of Trent, which calls indulgences *heavenly treasures*,* a phrase altogether inapplicable to a relaxation of humanly appointed punishments.

But to return to Dr. Milner. It is, I repeat, most edifying to observe, how ingeniously he has here kept out of view all connection between Purgatory and Indulgences: of the former not a hint is given, except in the very subdued expression, *temporal punishment*,—an expression, in which he might be quite sure that the majority of his Protestant readers would not find the meaning which he wished to conceal. And yet Purgatory, the pains of Purgatory, are the main, Bishop Fisher says the sole, matter of Indulgences.†

* Con. Trid. Sess. xxi.

† While this letter is going through the press, the evidence of Dr. Doyle, before the Committee of the House of Commons, has come to my hands. That divine does what Dr. Milner is anxious to do; he dissembles all connection between Indulgences and Purgatory; a point not quite suited to the polite ears of his examiners. He says, that “an indulgence relieves “the sinner entirely or in part from such *temporal* punishment, “as may remain hanging over him, after the guilt of his sin “may have been wiped away.”—*Second Report on State of Ireland*, p. 194.

Now* it is remarkable that in the whole of his statement he never once intimates that this *temporal* punishment is not con-

* See Supplemental Letter.

I have said, Sir, and I have said it with pleasure, that your's is the fairest statement of the

fined to this life, but extends also to the pains of Purgatory. He abstains from explaining this, even when the Committee distinctly inform him that their notion of the temporal punishment of which he has been speaking, limits it to this life. "*These infirmities*" (the sickness sent on many, and death on some, by reason of their unworthy communions) "*the Committee understand you to describe as the temporary penalties of sin* ; do you think that an indulgence can relieve from such infirmities, as *those which you describe as the temporary penalties of sin* ?" Mark his answer—He does not say that the Committee are right or wrong in their understanding of his words. But he proceeds in a manner that can leave no doubt, that his intention was to leave his examiners under the mistake, which they, with more than their ordinary caution, had professed, for the very purpose, if it was a mistake, that it might be rectified. "*I conceive, (says he) for instance, that the Almighty, upon the repentance of a sinner, might forgive the eternal guilt of such unworthy communion, as the apostle alludes to, but notwithstanding that the guilt had been remitted by God, yet such individual might be afflicted with sickness ; and I do conceive that, if upon the remission of the eternal guilt by God, this person availed himself of the indulgence which the Church might grant, the Almighty would relieve him from that sickness which otherwise might fall upon him.*"

Now, I would ask Dr. Doyle, whether the temporal punishment which his Church holds to be generally due after the guilt of sin is remitted, be not the *pains of Purgatory*, as well as God's inflictions on the sinner in this life ? I would also ask him, whether he have not himself taught that doctrine, as a Professor of Divinity in Ireland ? Does not the Council of

doctrine of Indulgences which I have seen in any of the modern apologists of your Church.

Trent distinctly decree it? Does not the Catechism of Trent teach* it? Does not the Class Book of Maynooth expressly argue, that, if this was not the case, the use of Indulgences (instead of being what the Council of Trent affirms, *maximè salutaris*) “ would be most injurious ; since by absolving from “ satisfactions enjoined in this life, which would have in some “ degree diminished what was due for sin, they would leave “ the sinner to suffer *much more heavy inflictions in Purgatory?*”†

The Committee further enquire of Dr. Doyle, whether there is “ any distinction between plenary and other Indulgences ? ” and here, too, his answer is worthy of remark : “ There is : “ an indulgence may be for some years, &c. or it may be a “ plenary indulgence : the meaning of a plenary indulgence is, “ that the Church thereby grants *as full* a remission of the “ temporal punishment or penance due to a sin, *as it is in the “ power* of the person granting the indulgence to bestow.”

Now the natural meaning of these words is, and the intention in using them seems to have been to imply, that the Church of Rome (not merely Dr. Doyle) doubts the power of any one, even of the Pope, to grant *a full remission*. We have seen above what Bellarmine says, and what Dr. Milner says, who quotes the Council of Trent for his authority. The Class Book of Maynooth itself, eager as it evidently is to avoid the acknowledgment of this full remission, admits that “ most “ divines, ‡ looking at the question speculatively, do hold the “ doctrine of a full remission being given by a plenary indul-

* See above, p. 116.

† De Pœn. app. p. 329.

‡ De Pœn. app. p. 339.

You openly and plainly declare, that “the temporal punishment due to sin by the decree of

“gence of all the temporal punishment due” (whether in this life or in Purgatory); it then states another opinion, as held by some divines (*etiam numero multi*), that the effect of a *plenary Indulgence* is only to make up the defects of a penitent who strives as much as is in his power to satisfy for himself; and sums up with speaking of the thing as uncertain in speculation, and still more in practice; but it does not even intimate Dr. Doyle’s ingenious suggestion. That suggestion he gives, not as his own, but clothes it with Papal authority, as “of one of the Bonifaces, in an explanation of the word “*plenary Indulgence*.” Here, manifestly, Dr. Doyle wishes it to be understood, that this Pope not only entertained the same doubt, but expressed or implied it, in a formal explanation of the word. This, however, must not be suffered to pass. Boniface neither implied nor dreamed of any such thing. The words cited, or rather alluded to, by Dr. Doyle, were not, as he says, in an explanation of a *plenary* indulgence, but of an expression more extravagant, which by an hyperbole, and almost a solecism, of Papal goodness, went, if possible, still further than a full remission. They occur in a gloss on the bull of Boniface VIII. (which will be quoted presently) giving at the Jubilee of the year 1300, *plenariam imo plenissimam remissionem*. The glossist says that he heard Boniface himself declare, that by the use of this prodigious superlative, he meant that there were no bounds to the extent of what he gave, but the bounds of his own power: but that his power did not reach to the entire and complete remission of all the pains of Purgatory, was a thought which never entered the head either of his Holiness or his Commentator. It wholly escaped the observation of Bellarmine too, in his elaborate treatise on this

“ God, when its guilt and eternal punishment
 “ are remitted, may consist either of evil in this

subject, and I am inclined to believe was launched for the first time before the Committee of the House of Commons, as a speculation on the suability of that new “ Assembly of Divines at Westminster.”

But “ other Bishops were to be examined besides Dr. Doyle ;
 “ and is it likely that such a man, so circumstanced, could utter
 “ a *deliberate falsehood* with detection and exposure staring him
 “ in the face ?” I am not inclined to charge Dr. Doyle with
 “ deliberate falsehood,” as far as his affirmations go—the *suppressio veri*, and the *adroit insinuatio falsi*, rather perhaps his readiness in assisting his learned auditors to deceive themselves, are all I remark in his case. And against this, I apprehend, the prospect of an examination of Drs. Murray and Kelly, conducted with the same sagacity as had distinguished the questions put to himself, did not constitute a very powerful security.

Of what passed between the Committee and those other Doctors, I shall not trouble myself to say much. I will quote one question, however, as a specimen of the perfect amiability of the whole proceeding. After the Committee had heard with the most exemplary composure all the common-place statements, which have been refuted almost as often they have been made, in palliation of the worship of Saints and Images, they actually propose the following searching question—“ *Then do you not conceive, according to your judgment, that the charge of Idolatry, which is brought against your Church, is—*
 “ *an unfounded charge ?*” * After this, I may excuse myself from occupying the time of my readers with any more notice

* Second Report on State of Ireland, p. 241.

“ life, or of temporal suffering in the next,
“ which temporal suffering in the next life you
“ call Purgatory; that the Church has received
“ power from God to remit both of these in-
“ fictions, and that this remission is called an
“ Indulgence.”*

Having said so much, and so fairly, I wish you had said a little more; I wish you had stated, (what you well know is a common matter of objection against your Church on this head, and was particularly and strongly pressed by Mr. Southey in the chapter which you were answering,) I mean the ground and foundation of this supposed power of your Church to grant Indulgences. It rests (as I need not remind you, though you have made it necessary that I should remind your readers) on the alleged “ treasure of your Church,” a treasure

of this Protestant Inquisition at present—(We must, I fear, return to it hereafter.) I will here only suggest, that, in the present liberal and enlightened age, its functions should be perpetuated; that the noble representative of the University of Cambridge, who presided at this day's sitting, be appointed Grand Inquisitor, and that every Honourable, or Right Honourable Member, who either belongs to the body, or cites their proceedings as authority, be entitled to utter as many sarcasms, as his wit will supply, against “ the ignorance of the Clergy.”

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 110.

which is absolutely inexhaustible ; for it consists, first, of all the merits of Christ's sufferings beyond what was necessary for the redemption of mankind ; and as those merits were infinite, their value could not be diminished by that or any other application of them : they must still, therefore, continue infinite. But, over and above, and (what is somewhat remarkable) in *aid* of this infinite treasure, you have, in the second place, a subsidiary hoard, namely, the merits of all the works, which all or any of the saints have ever performed beyond what was necessary to satisfy for themselves. These you, of course, regard as a very large sum : the Virgin Mary's merits in particular must have been enormous ; for she had not even venial sin of her own (as we have already seen) to curtail their amount. Now, all these merits, I say, are a sacred treasure to be dispensed at the discretion of the Church, that is, with rare exceptions, of the Pope, to meet the exigences of the faithful. Accordingly, Bellarmine has said that an "Indulgence" is nothing else, than an application of the "satisfactions, or penal works of Christ and the Saints."*

* Bell. de Purg. l. ii. c. 16.

That I have stated the doctrine of your Church on this point correctly, you will not, I flatter myself, attempt to deny. But yet it may be well to preclude all cavil from less candid controvertists.

First, then, the existence of this treasure is recognized in the decree of the Council of Trent, which I have already cited; *cœlestes hos Ecclesiæ Thesaurus** is the expression of the Council; and again in their last session, though, in the hurry of winding up their long arrears, they had not time for entering into details, yet they thought it right to decree most authoritatively, that Christ had given to the Church the power of conferring Indulgences,† and to condemn with an anathema those who deny it. This, therefore, is clearly a point of faith.

But the Council having contented itself with recognizing the existence of this treasure, and approving the use of it, we must, in the second place, go for further illustration to other quarters. Now, the bull of Clement VI.,‡ in which he reduces the time of Jubilee from every hundredth to every fiftieth year, distinctly says

* Sess. xxi.

† Con. Sess. xxv.

‡ Extrav. Clem. Unigenitus. Tit. de Pœn.

that as “ a single drop of Christ’s blood would
 “ have sufficed for the redemption of the whole
 “ human race,” the rest was not lost, but “ was
 “ a *treasure* which he acquired for the militant
 “ Church, to be used for the benefit of his sons:
 “ which treasure he would not suffer to be hid
 “ in a napkin, or buried in the ground, but com-
 “ mitted it to be dispensed by St. Peter and his
 “ successors, his own vicars upon earth, for
 “ proper and reasonable causes, for the total or
 “ partial remission of the temporal punishment
 “ due to sin: and for an augmentation of this
 “ treasure the merits of the blessed Mother of
 “ God, and of all the elect, are known to come
 “ in aid;” so that there is no ground of appre-
 hension, that it can be either spent or dimi-
 nished.

The same is repeated in a bull published by
 Leo X. de Indulgentiis. After distinctly ex-
 pressing the object of that bull to be “ that no
 “ one in future may allege ignorance of the
 “ doctrine of the Roman Church respecting
 “ Indulgences, and their efficacy,” he sets forth
 that “ the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Christ on
 “ earth, can, for reasonable causes, by the
 “ power of the keys, grant to the faithful,
 “ whether in this life or in Purgatory, Indul-
 gences *out of the superabundance of the merits of*

“ *Christ and of the Saints*, (expressly called a
 “ *treasure*,) and that those who have truly ob-
 “ tained these Indulgences are released from
 “ so much of the temporal punishment due for
 “ their actual sins to the divine justice, as is
 “ equivalent to the Indulgence granted and ob-
 “ tained.”

Again, among the propositions for which Luther was formally condemned by your Church, is the following, (No. 17.)—“ *Thesauri*
 “ *Ecclesiæ, unde Papa dat Indulgentias, non*
 “ *sunt merita Christi et sanctorum.*”*

Need I multiply proofs? It must surely be superfluous. I would only remark, that as all these bulls preceded the Council of Trent, and, especially, as it was the very end of that Council to correct the heretical notions which had been spread by Luther and his followers, we must understand the expression of “ heavenly treasures of the Church,” applied by it to Indulgences, in the sense which had been so distinctly, so repeatedly, and so recently, declared by Holy Pontiffs to be the sense of the Church.

Having thus settled the only question which it has been necessary to discuss with you on

* Ex Bulla Leon. X. adv. Luther. Bull. Mag. t. iv. p. 611.

this subject at present, I shall beg leave to return once more to Dr. Milner. He has thought fit to moot one or two points, which must not remain in the state in which he has left them.

It will have been observed, that Clement and Leo have, in their respective bulls, spoken of *reasonable causes*, for granting Indulgences. Who is to be the judge of the reasonableness of such causes? The Popes have uniformly proceeded on the notion of its being wholly in their discretion, though not quite at their arbitrary will. Dr. Milner, however, has imposed some specific limitations on them, for which he has gone to Bellarmine as his authority; I shall beg leave to follow him thither, and will request my readers to accompany us.

He says, then, that there must not only be "a just cause" for granting the Indulgence, "namely, the greater good of the penitent; or of the faithful; or of Christendom in general;" but "*there must also be a certain proportion between the punishment remitted and the good work performed*:"* and for this statement of the doctrine of your Church he quotes Bellarmine de Indulg. lib. i. c. 12.

Now the phrase *a certain proportion*, indefinite

* End of Controversy, p. 306.

as it is, does yet, I apprehend, in the common understanding of it, imply *some considerable* proportion; it has, in short, a very different meaning from the phrase, *some proportion or other*;* and yet the latter would be the more adequate translation of Bellarmine's words, *aliqua proportio*.

I assure you, Sir, it is with great reluctance that I submit to this minute and verbal criticism, to the drudgery of hunting an uncandid opponent through all the miserable shifts which a bad cause has induced him to try. I am also alive to the danger of disgusting my readers by inviting them to join in the same unpleasant task. But as it is necessary, I trust that they will bear with me for a little while.

I say, then, that it is not for nothing that Dr. Milner has adopted this method of adding to his author's meaning; as will, I think, be apparent from the following abstract of this chapter of Bellarmine's, which I have the more satisfaction in adducing, as it gives us a pretty good insight into the real nature of his rigorous notions about Indulgences.

The question proposed is, "Whether a just

* *Any*, it will be seen presently, is the strict meaning of the word, as it stands in Bellarmine.

“ cause be requisite, in order that an Indul-
 “ gence be valid ?” But from the points agreed
 to on all hands, especially as to its being not
 necessary that the work enjoined in the Indul-
 gence should be in itself so satisfactory, as to
 compensate the punishment remitted by it,
 “ (for then, in truth, it would not be an Indul-
 gence but a Commutation,)” the question again
 resolves itself into this, “ whether to constitute a
 “ just cause, there is required *any** proportion
 “ between the work enjoined and the Indul-
 “ gence granted, so that for a greater Indul-
 “ gence a greater cause be required, or may the
 “ very greatest Indulgence be granted for the
 “ very smallest work ?”

“ There are two opinions,” says Bellarmine,
 “ on this point ; one, that *not any proportion is*
 “ *required*,† but it is sufficient, if the cause be
 “ PIOUS, that is, not a work, which is merely
 “ temporal, or vain, or in no respect pertain-
 “ ing to the divine glory ;—but for any work
 “ whatsoever, which tends to the honour of
 “ God or the service of the Church, an Indul-
 “ gence will be valid. This was the doctrine
 “ of St. Thomas, St. Antonius, and many more.

* Quæstio igitur in eo solum versatur, an adjutam causam,
 requiritur proportio *aliqua*, &c.

† Non ullam proportionem requiri.

“The reasons for it,” continues Bellarmine, “are chiefly drawn from the practice of the Church; for we see, that for the same cause Indulgences of very different extent are given, sometimes greater, sometimes less. We also see, occasionally, the very greatest Indulgences granted for the very lightest causes; as when a *plenary Indulgence*” (which remits all the temporal punishment both in this world and in Purgatory) “is granted to all who stand before the gates of St. Peter’s, whilst the Pope gives his solemn blessing to the people on Easter-day.” “Besides, they argue, *if Indulgences granted without a sufficiently great cause were not valid, the Christian people would be grievously deceived by their pastors*, which is not by any means to be maintained.” “Lastly, Indulgences do not depend, for their efficacy, on consideration of the work enjoined, but on the infinite Treasure of the Merits of Christ and the Saints, which is a consideration surpassing and transcending every thing that is granted in an Indulgence.”

The other opinion is, that “to constitute a just cause for an Indulgence, the work enjoined must not only be pious and useful, but

“also bear a proportion* with the Indulgence; “so that it is not valid, if for the slightest cause “the greatest Indulgence be granted.” This, also, has great authorities on its side, and is the more common opinion. Bellarmine declares himself inclined to it. “But, perhaps,” says he, “the two may be reconciled,” a task which he immediately undertakes.

I will not inflict on my readers a detail of all the nice distinctions drawn by him; but I must give a few particulars, as illustrating both the doctrine and the practice of your Church; and I hope it will be borne in mind, that I quote from one who maintains the *more rigorous* notion.

“To constitute a just cause for an Indulgence,” says he, “the work enjoined must “tend to an end more pleasing in the sight of “God, than the satisfaction remitted. It must “also have some probability of attaining this “end. For instance, it would not be sufficient, “if a plenary indulgence were granted to all “who should once recite the Lord’s prayer for “the conversion of Heretics: or to those, who “should lay out a single piece of money for the “recovery of Jerusalem.”

* Quod proportionem habeat.

If this savours a little of austerity, the good Cardinal soon becomes more accommodating. Accordingly, he tells us next, that “in order to constitute a proportion between the cause and the Indulgence, it is not necessary, that the work enjoined be in itself very meritorious, or satisfactory, or difficult and laborious, (though these things ought to be regarded, too,) but that it be a mean apt and useful towards obtaining the end for which the Indulgence is granted. Therefore it may happen, that by a work in itself light and easy enough, a great Indulgence may be acquired; because, light and easy though it be, it is a mean of obtaining an end most pleasing to God. Such, says he, is the case in the very instance adduced, that of *standing before the Gates of St. Peter’s when the Pope gives his solemn blessing to the people*. This is called by those of the former opinion, a very light thing and a trifling cause,—and so it is, considered absolutely per se;—but the same act is called by the others (*the patrons of the rigorous scheme*) a great cause and a just; and their reason is, that a large resort of people at that time is a mean apt and useful to set forth faith respecting the head of the

“ Church, and to the honour of the Apostolic
“ See, which is the end of this Indulgence.”

One thing more is to be observed—“ A different judgment must be formed of the cause
“ of an Indulgence when granted to a single
“ person, and when granted in common to
“ many. In the former case, the work enjoined on that sole individual must be proportioned to the end for which the Indulgence is granted: but, in the other case, it is
“ only required that the work, not of every one
“ singly, but, of all together, be proportioned
“ to that end. For instance, if it be necessary to
“ build a Basilica, or a Hospital, and an Indulgence of seven or ten years, or even a plenary
“ one, be given to all who contribute a certain
“ sum, the work of each, taken singly, will not
“ seem a just cause; but if the whole amount
“ of what is supplied by all be considered,
“ then the cause will be just, because enough
“ will have been given to build the Basilica, or
“ Hospital, and such building will be more
“ pleasing to God, than the satisfaction which
“ is remitted by the Indulgence.”

To Here, then, we have the real extent of the limitation, urged by Dr. Milner; we have it from the authority to which he himself refers,

and from which, therefore, he will not be permitted to recede:—Bellarmine has told us, what is “the proportion” required, to make such instruments valid, “between the punishment remitted, and the good work performed;” and, I think, the most faint-hearted of Dr. Milner’s flock will not be much terrified by the result. Bellarmine, too, absolutely repels the notion of there being, in the main, any danger of the people’s being deceived; “for,” says he, “we do not believe that Indulgences are granted by the Apostolic See without just cause;” and he had just before said, “although it is requisite that the cause of an Indulgence be just, it is not for subjects (the people) to judge in any case, whether it be just, or not; for *it is their duty simply to believe, that it is just.*” Yet, after all,” says he, “as an Indulgence is without effect, if it be received by one who is not properly qualified, (which cannot happen to any who is in a state of Grace,) or if it be granted by one who has not authority, (the Pope confessedly has full authority,) so it may likewise be void ob defectum causæ:—a prudent man, therefore, so receives those indulgences, as at the same

* Debent simpliciter existimare justam esse.

“time to endeavour to bring forth fruits meet
“for repentance, and to satisfy the Lord him-
“self for his own sins.”

Having seen the doctrine, let us now enquire a little into the practice, of your Church respecting Indulgences.

The earliest instances, which we find, were those granted in favour of all who undertook the Cross, and engaged in the wars for the recovery of the Holy Land, or in the expedition against the Moors in Spain. It is well known, that, for the encouragement of warriors to undertake these enterprizes, there was proclaimed by Popes “remission of all their Sins”—remission, that is, of all other satisfactions for the temporary punishment due to mortal Sins remitted in the Sacrament of Penance—of course, therefore, a free passage to Heaven without any intermediate sufferings in Purgatory. And this, it must be allowed, was only putting the armies of the Cross on an equal footing with those of the Crescent. Mahomet had promised to his followers, that all who fell in battle on his side should be admitted at once to the joys of Paradise; and was it reasonable, that the Popes should be backward in affording similar encouragement to Christian warriors?

After the precedent, and with a slight exten-

sion of the principle, of these grand Indulgences, was another, which was granted by the fourth, or, as it is commonly called, the Great Council of Laterane, at which Innocent III. presided in person over more than 1200 Prelates. That numerous and infallible body was inspired to declare, that “*all Catholics, who, assuming the badge of the Cross, should take up arms for the extermination of Heretics, should enjoy the same Indulgence, and be protected by the same holy Privilege (remission of every sin) as is granted to those who go to the relief of the Holy Land.*”*

Before this time, Honorius II. had adopted the same principle, and had beat up for recruits in a war of his own seeking, and solely for the honour of the Holy See, with the promise of the same Indulgence, the same remission of all Sin, the same immunity from future suffering, for his pay.†

* Catholici verò qui crucis assumpto caractere ad hæreticorum exterminium se accinxerint, illâ gaudeant indulgentiâ, illoque privilegio sint muniti, quod accedentibus in terræ sanctæ subsidium conceditur.—Concil. Lab. t. xi. p. 149.

† Roger, Count of Sicily, on succeeding to the throne of that Island, refused to hold it as a dependency on the See of Rome. To teach this prince what was due to the successors of St. Peter, the warlike Pope had immediate recourse to arms. The recruit-scene is well described by Baronius (in A. D. 1127). The

But these are all military and somewhat perilous works. There were other Indulgences granted on more peaceful and ordinary occasions. Such was that of Paschal II. in favour of all who devoutly visited the Churches of the Apostles at Rome; such, too, was that which we have already seen in Bellarmine, in favour of those who assist at the Pope's solemn Benediction on Easter-Day. In process of time, indeed, Indulgences, even plenary ones, were to be had on extremely reasonable terms. In the pontificate of Leo X. they were some of the most marketable commodities of the day, and seem to have been sold sufficiently cheap. A great historian of your own Church (for I abstain from Hæretical authorities) informs us that "Leo, following the advice of Cardinal Pucci, " had spread throughout the world the amplest indulgences, not only for the benefit of " the living, but also with power to loose the " Souls of the dead from Purgatory: which " things, having in themselves neither proba-

Pope's proclamation is as follows: " *Ex auctoritate divinâ et* " *B. M. V. et SS. App. meritis talem eis (Honorius) impendit* " *retributionem, ejusmodi, viz. quòd qui delictorum suorum* " *pœnitentiam sumpserint, et in expeditione illâ morentur,* " *peccata universa remisit. Illorum autem qui ibi mortui non* " *fuerint, et confessi sunt, medietatem donarit.*"

“ bility nor authority, (it being notorious that
 “ they were granted solely to extort money
 “ from those who had more simplicity than
 “ prudence,) and being, besides, exercised most
 “ impudently by the Commissaries deputed to
 “ this exaction, (the greatest part of whom pur-
 “ chased from the Court the power of exer-
 “ cising them) had excited in many places great
 “ indignation and scandal, especially in Ger-
 “ many, where *faculties for liberating the souls of*
 “ *the dead from Purgatory were sold at a trifling*
 “ *price, or made the stakes of gambling in taverns.*
 “ And the mischief was encreased by the Pope
 “ having given to his sister, Maddalene, the
 “ emolument, and the exaction, of Indulgences,
 “ in many parts of Germany.”*

If you object to the authority of Guicciardini,
 even for the matter of fact, I shall not stop to
 defend it, but shall leave it, without comment,
 to my readers. Or, if, which is more probable,
 you prefer condemning Leo, and charging him
 and his Court with the guilt of deceiving those
 who were so unhappy as to live in his time, and
 who, on the principle laid down by Bellarmine,
 could derive no benefit from these Indulgences,
 which were void ob defectum causæ, I will pro-

* Guicciardini, Ist. d'Italia, l. 13. anno 1520,

ceed to one or two cases, as well as authorities, against which you can have no objection.

The Bull of Boniface VIII.,* establishing the centenary Jubilee, “for the increase of the
“honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, in order
“that their Basilicæ may be more devoutly
“frequented by the faithful, and the faithful
“themselves be made more replete with spiri-
“tual gifts,”—(a cause which you will not deny to be just,) grants to all persons, verè pœnitentibus, et confessis, who shall come to the said Basilicæ in the present year 1300, or any future hundredth year, “not merely a
“plenary, but a most plenary pardon of all
“their Sins,”† if, being Romans, they shall visit the same at least thirty days, and at least once in every day; or, being foreigners, if they shall do in like manner for fifteen days. But every one will merit more, and acquire the indulgence more efficaciously, who shall visit the same more largely and more devoutly. •

I need not inform you, Sir, that the interval between Jubilees was subsequently abridged, first to fifty years, afterwards to thirty-three,

* Extrav. Comm. l. v. de pœn. c. 1.

† “Non solum plenam, et largiorem, immò *plenissimam* omnium suorum concedimus veniam peccatorum.” It is on this word *plenissimam* that the gloss, cited by Dr. Doyle, was made.

and lastly to twenty-five years, at which term it now continues, and the Indulgence granted is still the same. By the Bull of Indiction of the Jubilee of *the present year*, the Pope “*mercifully* in the Lord grants and imparts “to all the faithful in Christ who are truly “penitent and confessed, &c., the most full and “plenary *indulgence, remission, and pardon of all “their Sins,*” provided they shall have complied with the condition prescribed in the Bull of Boniface, and the additional condition of “pouring forth *pious prayers to God*, for the “exaltation of the Church, *the extirpation of “Heresies, the concord of the Catholic Princes,* “and the salvation and tranquillity of the “Christian People.”

These, then, are all unexceptionable cases, where there is the proportion required between the Indulgence granted and the work enjoined ; and they afford an additional facility to the opulent, to those who can afford to undertake these distant and costly expeditions, or can purchase the assistance of others in executing them on their behalf.

But, besides the work, which will, of course, vary according to the occasion, you tell us, that “to every Indulgence there is one condi-

“ tion always annexed, I mean *sincere repentance* ;” and Dr. Milner says, that “ this is “ always enjoined or implied in the grant of it, “ and is indispensably necessary for the effect “ of every grace.”* What your Church means by Repentance will come more regularly into consideration in my next letter : meanwhile, you will permit me here to apprise my Protestant readers, that we shall find it a very different thing from the repentance of the Church of England. But I notice this matter at present, merely to remind you, that you and your friend have forgotten the case of Indulgences granted to the Souls already in Purgatory. You will not, I am sure, deny that these souls may be the subjects of Indulgences : for if you do, I shall be obliged to bring divers Bulls, and other formidable artillery, to bear upon you. In short, it is quite certain, that the Pope has as much power to apply the Satisfactions of Christ and the Saints, out of his holy Treasure, to the dead, as to the living—so says Dr. Milner’s alleged authority on this head, Cardinal Bellarmine ; † so says Leo X. in the Bull al-

* End of Controversy, p. 304.

† Bell. de Ind. l. i. c. 14.

ready cited; so says the more modern authority, the Class Book for the use of Candidates in Theology, at Maynooth.*

Now, these deceased subjects of the Pope's Indulgences must, of course, be free from all necessity, as they are removed from all possibility, of Repentance: and as it is a matter of some curiosity, and much edification, to learn the manner in which these instruments are available for them, I must trespass again on your patience, while I refer to the authority to which Dr. Milner has directed us.

On this subject, then, Bellarmine tells us, that "the Pope applies the Satisfaction of Christ and the Saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living. They are applied, not in the way of judicial Absolution, but *in the way of payment, per modum solutionis.*" It is, in short, a matter of strict account: a debtor and creditor sheet is regularly supposed in this Papal Saving-Bank. For, as when a person gives alms, or fasts, or makes a pilgrimage, on account of the dead, the effect is not that he obtains absolution for them from their liability to punish-

* Tractatus de Sacram. Poenit. ad usum Theologiæ Candidatorum, Autore Delahogue, p. 350.

“ment; but he presents to God, that particular *Satisfaction for them*,” (in other words, he pays in so much to their credit,) “in order that God, on receiving it, may liberate the dead from” (either all or part, as the case may be, of) “the debt of punishment, which they had to pay: in like manner, the Pope” (in granting to them Indulgences) “does not *absolve* the deceased, but *offers to God out of the Treasure of Satisfaction as much as is necessary to free them.*”

Now, here again, Sir, we have a most comfortable prospect for the wealthy penitent on his death-bed. Cannot he make it worth the pains of some less opulent brother, to discharge for him some work or other, which shall entitle him to a plenary Indulgence? At the worst, a prudent Testator will not find it difficult to avoid lying in Purgatory beyond the next Jubilee.

There yet remains one point, which must not be omitted; and which cannot be better introduced than by an extract from Dr. Doyle's recent examination before the Committee of the House of Commons.

Was it ever the doctrine of your Church, or has it been any part of the practice of it, that those

indulgences should extend to the remission of the temporal consequences with respect to crimes to be committed? A. *Never at any period.*

The reason you were asked that question is, because the Committee are aware that a *vulgar error* has prevailed on that subject? A. *Yes, it is a horrible imputation.**

Horrible indeed! But is Dr. Doyle, or the Committee, (who so confidently treat the very notion as a *vulgar error*,) quite sure of the ground on which they speak? I am afraid I must undertake to prove, that *the vulgar error* is not on the side which they suppose. In the works of a Roman-Catholic writer of high reputation in his own days, Claudius Espencæus, I meet with the following indignant attestation to the existence, the wide extent, and long duration of this monstrous abuse. It occurs in his Digressio 2da to the Epistle to Titus, at ch. i. v. 7.—A Bishop must be—“not given to filthy lucre.” After having spoken of certain abuses of the Papal see itself, it thus proceeds, “A bove majori discit arare minor.” “These inferiors, not Bishops only, but Archdeacons and their officials, in the course of their visita-

* Second Report, &c. p. 195.

“ tions, no longer pursue the ancient salutary
 “ discipline of deterring from vice by severe cor-
 “ rections, but extort and squeeze the money of
 “ the Clergy and the Laity—under the name of
 “ procuration, not to say, fictitious jurisdiction.
 “ But *what is most base of all, they permit them,*
 “ *for a certain annual fixed rate of payment, to live*
 “ *with concubines and harlots.* ‘ Let him have his
 “ ‘ concubine,’ say they, ‘ if he will.’ ” “ These
 “ scandals are collected from the gravamina of
 “ the Germans, where they occur in every line.
 “ Instances of filthy lucre, such as these, might
 “ be supposed to be invented through hatred
 “ to the Pope, if, as he* complains, there were

* Hæc, inquam, lucra turpia odio Pontificis Romani ficta sint, si non, quod ait et conqueritur, ille velut

Prostat et in quæstu pro meretrice sedet
 liber palàm ac publicè, &c.

I have translated this passage (which is not quite clear) in the manner which seems most favourable to the Church of Rome. If there be here an appearance that the reigning Pope Pius IV. (or V.) was innocent of this enormity, enough is afterwards said to fix the guilt on the See of Rome itself. Besides what we are told in the next page of the *Pope's Legates*, the following occurs. Habeat jam Roma pudorem, et tam nullius frontis criminum omne genus catalogum prostituere desinat.—Nec verò est, quòd speret Pontifex Galliam nostratē adeò deformem reformare, adeò nutantem continere posse, nisi, &c. et *taxas illas αίσχροκερδείας* nomine multis merito maledictis multorum taxatas, *reliquamque Cameræ Cancellariæque*

“ not openly and publicly printed and sold, in
 “ *this place (Paris) at this day, as in former times,*
 “ a Book, entitled ‘Taxa Cameræ seu Cancel-
 “ ‘lariæ Apostolicæ,’ in which you may learn
 “ more of crimes, than in all the summists and
 “ summaries of all the vices that can be named;
 “ and *in which there is set forth to very many even*
 “ *a license,* but to all, who will pay for it, an
 “ absolution.”

“ It is wonderful,” he presently continues,
 “ that at this time, and during the existence of
 “ the present Schism, (it was written soon after
 the Reformation,) this Index, as it were, to so
 “ many, so foul, so horrible wickednesses has
 “ not been suppressed—a thing so infamous
 “ that I do not think in Germany, in Switzer-
 “ land, or any country else that has separated
 “ from the Roman See, any work can be pub-
 “ licly exposed to sale, more full of scandal to
 “ the Church, than this. And yet *so far is it*
 “ *from being suppressed by the friends of the Ro-*

*Apostolicæ negotiationem nundinationemque, quasi quoddam Augeæ
 Stabulum tandem repurget.*

It further appears from Espencæus, that this abuse was of long standing; for he says, that an officer of Innocent VIII. who lived in the preceding century, modò Cameram Apostolicam pecuniarum Matrem appellat, modò venalia Romæ omnia agnoscit.

*“man Church, that licenses and impunities for the
 “commission of such enormous crimes are in a
 “great measure renewed and confirmed in the
 “faculties of the Legates who come hither from
 “Rome.”*

I have cited this passage at a length which may be tedious, but I have done so in order to prove beyond contradiction the existence of this great abuse; an abuse so far beyond all ordinary bounds of credibility, that any contradiction of it, on whatever authority, is received with a ready belief. Even your inaccuracy, and Dr. Milner's oft convicted insincerity, might still leave you credit for your assertion, that this “*Taxa Cameræ Apostolicæ*,” was no more than “a rate of fees for the *document* of
 “absolution, which in certain great cases could
 “be obtained from the Pope only, and in order
 “to defray the expenses attending the appli-
 “cation;*” and for Dr. Milner's,† that “in
 “case there ever was the least real ground-
 “work for this vile book, which I cannot find
 “that there was, the money paid into the
 “Papal Chancery *could be nothing else* but the
 “*fees of office* on restoring certain culprits to

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 111.

† End of Controversy, p. 293. note.

“ the *civil privileges* which they had forfeited by “ their crimes.” But the testimony of Espen-cæus has stripped both you and him of these vain pleas, and has exposed this foul particular of your Church’s corruption in all its deformity.

Before I conclude this letter, I suppose I must say something to the point, which you and Dr. Milner display so much eagerness to press against the Church of England, I mean, that she, too, “ grants Indulgences ” in certain cases. I shall dispose of this matter in a single sentence. The Church of England has, in many instances, permitted the commutation of certain Ecclesiastical Punishments into another form of Punishment, pecuniary fines, which fines are to be employed (according to the authority cited by Dr. Milner himself) for the relief of the poor, or other pious uses : whether this be wise or unwise, is, in my present argument, a matter of perfect indifference ; I will only say, that as soon as the Church of Rome shall reduce her own doctrine and practice on the article of Indulgences to the same point, she shall hear no more reproaches from us on this head.

LETTER IX.

*Confession and Absolution in the Church of Rome.—
Statement of Doctrine and Practice of the Church of
England on those points.*

WE are now come to a part of our subject, on which I feel it difficult to write, without expressing more warmth of indignation against the doctrine of your Church, than it would perhaps, in addressing you, become me to exhibit. I abstain, therefore, and shall content myself with simply stating, in the first instance, what that doctrine is. But in order to do this satisfactorily, it is necessary that I should say something for the information of my Protestant readers of the supposed sacrament, to which Confession and Absolution belong.

It is, then, the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that mortal Sins, committed after Baptism, are remitted only in the sacrament of penance: and of this sacrament the form, that which constitutes it a sacrament, is the speech of the Priest, *Ego te absolvo, &c.*: that the *matter* of

it, or rather, as the Council of Trent* expresses it, the *quasi* matter, are the acts of the penitent himself, namely contrition, confession to the Priest, and satisfaction. Of these acts, *Contrition* is “the inward grief and detestation on account of Sin committed, with a purpose of not sinning in future.” It is sometimes made perfect with love, and reconciles the sinner to God, before recourse has actually been had to the sacrament of penance; but then the reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition, without the wish and purpose† of having recourse to the sacrament, which wish and purpose are included in that perfect contrition. But imperfect contrition, or *attrition*, as it is called, since it commonly arises either from a consideration of the baseness of Sin, or from the fear of Hell and punishment, if it exclude the present will of sinning, and be accompanied with the hope of pardon, is an impulse of the Holy Spirit; and, therefore, though by itself without the Sacrament of Penance, it will not lead the Sinner to justification; yet it disposes him to obtain the grace of God in that sacrament.—In short, the Council of Trent has

* Sess. xiv.

† Sine Sacramenti voto. Ibid.

settled, (and so it is stated by Bellarmine,* and admitted, I believe, universally,) that attrition, though by itself it will not do, yet with absolution, is sufficient.

It will be observed, that the Council has not declared, whether Attrition includes the Love of God in any measure or degree. The absence of any express affirmation would, in this case, seem to imply the negative. Yet the scandal, arising from such a doctrine, and the arguments raised against it by Protestant writers, have induced many of your divines to maintain that some degree of the love of God, an initial love of him, is necessary. But this doctrine is opposed by other and higher authorities, in particular by one, which is *instar omnium*, Clement XI. pronouncing *ex cathedrâ* in the well-known Bull “*Unigenitus*,” a Bull admitted, I believe, after whatever difficulties, by all your Churches in Continental Europe. He has therein *condemned* the following positions. 47. “The obedience of the law ought to flow from its source, that is, love; when the love of God is its principle within, and the glory of God its end, then the outer act is pure; without it, it is nothing but hypocrisy, or false righteousness.”

* De Pœnit. lib. ii. c. 18. ad finem.

49. "As there is no sin without self-love, so
"there is no good work without the love of
"God." *These propositions, I say, are con-*
demned; and thus authority is given to the
Jesuits, in whose especial favour that Bull
issued, for maintaining that "Men are not
"obliged to love God in order to be reconciled
"to him in the Sacrament of Penance, nor to
"refer all their actions to him; that it is suffi-
"cient to serve him through the fear of Hell;
"that those Sinners who have no better dispo-
"sition than a strong fear of being damned,
"who repent of their crimes only on this mo-
"tive, and who would, by consequence, in the
"bottom of their heart, wish that there was no
"such thing as Religion, are nevertheless in a
"state to receive absolution, and that they ought
*"to be admitted to the Sacrament."**

Such, Sir, is the doctrine for which the Church of Rome is answerable; it flows from the very principle laid down by the Council of Trent, and has been virtually set forth (through condemnation of better principles) by the highest authority of your Church. That these profligate notions are not universally maintained I

* La Constitution Unigenitus, avec des Remarques et des Notes, p. 20.

freely admit; in particular, (as I think it fair to add,) not by the Class-Book* for the College of Maynooth. That work proceeds indeed with extreme caution in this particular; it first lays down that an initial love may be compared to the morning-dawn, or to the incipient warmth of day (*not however in its being followed of course by full day, but*) as the dawn is of the same nature with the full day, warm in one degree, while the more advanced stage is warm in two, three, four degrees, and so on:—"in like manner the " initial love may belong to the same species " with more advanced love, if both spring from " the same motive of either hope or charity."—Having described its subject in this very guarded manner, it proceeds to say that "the initial " love which is requisite for sufficient *attrition* " in the sacrament, must be conceived from the " latter motive, from charity, or love of God for " his own sake." And this is as far as the most enlarged view of the doctrine of the Council of Trent can enable its most ingenious Commentator to go.

So much for the first of the Sinner's acts in this Sacrament, *Contrition*, or Repentance, that "Repentance," which Dr. Milner tells us, as

* *Tractatus de Pœn.* (aut. L. A. Delahogue) p. 108—110.

we have before seen, “ is indispensably necessary for every grace :” that Repentance, which we have been lately assured by the most distinguished Member of the House of Commons is the same with the repentance of the Church of England, in other words, with change of heart, hatred and utter abandonment of Sin, sincere and ardent love of God and holiness.

The next particular is *Confession*, which I need scarcely add is not merely, as with us, a humble acknowledgment of our guilt before God, and a private or open acknowledgment of our offences against our neighbour (according as the duty of compensating the injury done to him shall require); but it is a secret, indeed, but full and unreserved, disclosure of every mortal sin, with all the circumstances which may change the nature of it, to the Priest. Of venial Sins it is not necessary, though right and useful, to make a similar confession. But as for mortal sins, the penitent must explore every hidden thought and all the darkest recesses of his conscience, in order that he may make the confession as full and complete as possible.* This is enjoined by

* Con. Trid. sess. xiv. c. 5. On the distinction between mortal and venial Sins, it is not necessary that I should here remark, beyond expressing a strong sense of the dangerous consequences to which it tends.

the great Council of Laterane, to be done by every one, arrived at the years of discretion, at least once in every year, at Easter:* and although that provision is not indispensable, yet the Council of Trent hath decreed that Sacramental Confession is absolutely necessary to Salvation: an Anathema is pronounced against all who presume to say the contrary.†

Such is the doctrine of your Church on this particular. On the practical mischiefs to which it leads, the opposite extremes of extreme scrupulosity, and callous indifference,—still more, on its glaring tendency to rob the tender, unhacknied, unseared conscience of youth, of that which is at once its best protection and its most appropriate grace, the delicacy of ingenuous shame; on its telling those into whose young bosoms the first ideas of impurity never perhaps intruded, without exciting a thrill of terror, that they must dwell on the thought from which their better mind recoils; that they are to register it faithfully in their memory, and in due time give utterance to it in the presence of one, whose sex ought to inspire them with dread, even if his character be as holy as his office,—

* Concil. Labb. tom. xi. p. 174.

† Con. Trid. sess. xiv. can. 6.

on these, and consequences scarcely less mischievous than these, I forbear to enlarge. Let me only say, that they are not imaginary. I have looked into a tract, which, you inform us, is the most popular of all your books of devotion, "The Garden of the Soul." I have read there, (I acknowledge it with pleasure) sentiments of piety as warm and as just, as the expression of them is beautiful: but I have also read one page—prescribing a course of self-examination previous to confession,—to which I cannot even allude without disgust. Nothing, I verily believe, more loathsome, or polluting, could be found in the journal of a brothel. Tell us not, that the young penitent is not obliged to confess these things, such of them at least as fall short of mortal sin: the Catechism of Trent* requires that not only deeds and words, but even thoughts be recollected and confessed: the Council itself recommends the confession even of Venial Sins; and, if it did not, would you begin thus early to corrupt and harden their conscience by setting it to work on these nice distinctions?

But I turn to the remaining act of the penitent, *Satisfaction*. Satisfaction in general is

* Con. Trid. sess. xiv. c. 9.

defined by the Catechism of Trent, perfect payment of a debt; and in the present case, the word is used to express the compensation made when a man pays to God something in full on account of Sins committed.* Sacramental Satisfaction is the discharging such penances as shall be enjoined by the Priest after Confession. But it is not necessary to his obtaining the end and benefit of the sacrament, reconciliation with God, that he should complete this satisfaction. He may, if he choose, neglect all the penances enjoined him; and yet the grace of the sacrament, and the consequent right and title to admission into Heaven will remain unimpaired, so long as he does not fall again into mortal Sin. Meanwhile, the unfulfilled satisfaction (if also unremitted) will stand in account against him, and will remain to be discharged in Purgatory; unless some of the various expedients for his release, of which we have already seen and heard enough, be happily adopted. On this article therefore I shall not dwell; but shall proceed to Absolution.

The words of the Priest, “ I absolve thee,”

* *Est autem satisfactio, rei debitæ integra solutio, &c. Quod ad hunc locum attinet, doctores ad declarandam eam compensationem usurpârunt, cùm homo pro peccatis commissis Deo aliquid persolvit. Cat. Rom. p. 2.*

are, I repeat, the form of the Sacrament, what makes it to be a Sacrament. And they confer, as is the property of a Sacrament, the grace which they signify. They confer reconciliation with God, absolution, or remission of all Sins, on those who receive the Sacrament with that Contrition, or Attrition, and that Confession which have been described; and be it remembered, that this grace of reconciliation with God (as I before said) can be obtained by those who have fallen into mortal Sin after Baptism, only in this Sacrament, ordinarily, never without the desire of it. “ *For not, as under the old Law, is there now a power in the Church given to Priests only to declare any person to be absolved from sin: but they do, as the Ministers of God, truly absolve them: the same thing which God himself does, who is the Author and Father of grace and righteousness.*” *

The Council of Trent, indeed, distinctly and in the strongest terms decrees that the Priests are Judges, and their absolution strictly judicial. And this is stated by it to make an important difference between Baptism and this Sacrament, (and of course between the absolutions respec-

* I quote here from the Dublin Edition of the Catechism of the Council of Trent faithfully translated into English by permission. p. 211.

tively given in the two). “ In Baptism the
 “ Minister ought not to be a Judge, for the
 “ Church exercises no judgment over those
 “ who are not yet within it. But after Baptism
 “ Sinners are not to be cleansed by a repetition
 “ of Baptism, but they are to be made to stand
 “ as criminals before this tribunal, in order that
 “ as often as penitents have recourse to it, after
 “ sins committed, they may be released by the
 “ sentence of the Priests.”* For “ although
 “ the absolution of the Priest be the dispensa-
 “ tion of a benefit belonging to another, yet it
 “ is not merely a naked ministerial act of either
 “ announcing the Gospel, or declaring that sins
 “ are pardoned, but it is *equivalent to a judicial*
 “ *Act, wherein sentence is pronounced by himself,*
 “ *as a Judge.*”† And this is afterwards re-
 affirmed with an anathema annexed on all who
 deny it.‡

We have thus seen the doctrine of your
 Church respecting Confession and Absolution.
 You, in this instance, (as I have been sorry to
 find, in different degrees, is almost invariably
 your practice,) have contrived to evade the
 whole of the real question at issue between the

* Con. Trid. Sess. xiv. c. 2.

† C. 6. ad instar actûs judicialis, quo ab ipso, velut a judice,
 sententia pronunciatur.

‡ Can. 9.

two Churches, and have affected to perceive no difference between them. For this purpose you cite a passage from Dr. Milner's *End of Controversy*, and another from Chillingworth, which do not at all touch on the points of difference. Consult your own heart, Sir, and let that tell you, whether you have not here deeply, I had almost said, shamefully, prevaricated. You know that auricular confession is, with you, an essential part of a Sacrament, which, as you value your soul's salvation, you must perform. You also know, that, with us, the same Confession is not at all required as a necessary service, not as a part of repentance, not even of discipline:—that it is merely a matter recommended to those sinners whose troubled conscience admits not of being quieted by self-examination however close and searching, nor any other instruction however diligent; that he only who “*requireth further comfort or counsel,*” after all that he can do for himself, is invited to repair “to some discreet and learned Minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the Ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.”

Your spiritual guide, Dr. Milner, has thought

fit, with his usual fairness, to avoid quoting this passage which stands in our present office for the Communion, and therefore expresses plainly the meaning of our Church; but, instead of it, has had recourse to an order composed by Cranmer, for which we are not more responsible than for any thing in your Missal. And this he does, merely because he can thus forward his object of misrepresenting our practice in this particular a little (and but a very little) better, than by the production of the real language of our Church.—You, I am sorry to perceive, have not thought it beneath you to adopt his artifice.

Without troubling myself to follow him or you minutely in this part of your work, I shall proceed to state briefly what else our Church teaches, or requires, in respect both to confession, especially secret confession, and also to absolution.

The Confession ordinarily required is only general and public Confession to Almighty God, made simultaneously by the whole congregation, every individual being expected tacitly to include the acknowledgment of his particular transgressions under the general form. This Confession occurs at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, and in a different form in

the Office of Communion, and is always followed by Absolution. In the two former cases the nature of the absolving power committed by God to his Ministers is expressly stated; it is "to declare and" (not only declare, but) "pronounce" (that is, authoritatively declare in God's name) "to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their Sins;" and having made that statement, the Priest exercises his power by declaring that God *then* "pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel."

In the Communion Service, the Church does not again state the nature of the absolving power, (it would have been unnecessary,) but directs the Priest to exercise it in a somewhat different, an optative form. But this form is equivalent to the other: it consists of a declaration of God's general evangelical promises, and invokes the fulfilment of those promises in favour of those who have just made their humble confession to him.—Such is the ordinary confession and absolution of our Church. But in the office last mentioned, the Church further invites those who need ghostly counsel and advice, (in the terms already cited,) to have recourse to particular confession, and to seek the benefit

of particular absolution. And here again the nature of that particular absolution is distinctly intimated to be of the same kind as the two former instances of general absolution; it is to be exercised (not by the judicial sentence of the Priest, after a process carried on before his tribunal, as your Church insists, but) “*by the Ministry of God’s holy word,*” or an authoritative declaration of God’s general promises applied in favour of that particular penitent, if he be indeed penitent.

There remains one other instance, that in the Visitation of the Sick, which has been correctly though not fully cited by Dr. Milner. The Rubric requires, that at a certain part of this office “the sick person shall be moved by the Minister to make a special Confession of his Sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.” I have said that this is ordered *at a certain part of the Office*, and it is important that this be borne in mind. For so little is our Church inclined to encourage its Ministers in prying into the secrets of their penitents, that it enjoins every other step to be previously taken, before the last measure of particular confession be proposed.—“The Minister shall (first) examine whether he (the sick person) repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity

“ with all the world ; exhorting him to forgive,
“ from the bottom of his heart, all persons that
“ have offended him ; and if he hath offended
“ any other, to ask them forgiveness ; and
“ where he hath done injury or wrong to any
“ man, that he make amends to the utmost of
“ his power.”

Now, it is after he has done and said all this,
—after he has satisfied himself on such general
enquiry, whether the sick person have indeed
a true sense of the awful condition in which he
stands, of the nature and necessity of sincere
repentance, and universal charity—and whether
he have, by God’s blessing, attained those
graces, as well as learned the necessity of at-
taining them,—that the minister’s duty respect-
ing particular confession is laid down. If from
the sick man’s answers to his enquiries, he find
him in a state of penitence and peace, his busi-
ness is completed ; he is not authorized,—he is
by implication forbidden,—to move him to any
further disclosure :—and *in this case* (as it will
be necessary to bear in mind) *no absolution is*
pronounced, evidently because particular abso-
lution is to be given in our Church only to those
whose minds cannot be quieted without such
especial application to them of God’s general
promises.—But if, after all general discourse

and advice on the nature of repentance and the means of making his peace with God have been exhausted, the sick man still exhibit signs of distrust and dismay,—he is to be asked, whether “he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter:” and if he say that it is, then, and only then, he is “to be moved to a special confession of his Sins;” evidently, in the words of the former exhortation, that he may receive ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.

Now, as nothing can be more prudent than this reserve and backwardness in inviting to secret confession, when the end of our ministry can be obtained without it, so nothing certainly can be more necessary to the due discharge of the commission we have received, as Christ’s Ministers, Christ’s Ambassadors, appointed and empowered to reconcile sinful man to God, than that, when all other instruction and means have failed, we should then require of those for whom we are to give account, that they enable us to know more clearly of their state; that they tell us specially what it is that weighs them down, and deprives them of that most important grace and duty, Christian hope. “Confess your sins to God,” such is our coun-

sel, “ we wish not, we seek not to know them;
“ but if you cannot otherwise apply what you
“ have been taught of God’s general promises to
“ your own case, unbosom yourself freely to us,
“ —tell us, in that sacred confidence which
“ ought to subsist between a Christian minister
“ and him who is about to stand before his
“ Judge,—tell us what it is which thus shakes
“ your soul with dread, and renders you inca-
“ pable of the holy consolations of the Gospel
“ of Peace. Your very terrors prove at least,
“ that you are not hardened ; that your state is
“ better than that of the unhappy soul, which
“ is ready to wing its flight into an eternal
“ world, in stupid and reckless insensibility to
“ its danger. We are ordained to preach the
“ glad tidings of great joy ; to minister the word
“ of God ; to pronounce the pardon of God over
“ all who with true faith turn unto him. And
“ weak though we be,—sinners, miserable sin-
“ ners, though we be,—we have yet the promise
“ of Him, who cannot lie, that he ‘ will be with
“ ‘ us alway even unto the end of the world,’—
“ that he will bless his own ordinances, and make
“ them, when duly ministered and devoutly
“ received, effectual to the salvation of men.”
You, Sir, in all this will, I am sure, see
nothing to condemn, except the caution and

hesitation with which we admit the special communications of the penitent. You know that this is the only case, in which we venture to urge the practice of secret confession—the case of him, for whom nothing else will do:—that we are indeed ready to receive it, if tendered for the purpose of quieting a perplexed conscience, at any time, and especially to enable the penitent to approach the table of the Lord in faith and hope.—But you also know, that in the main course of our exhortation and practice in this particular, we are directly opposed to the Church of Rome. Why then will you be so uncandid, as to affect to think that we are alike? why will you be so weak (pardon the expression), as to throw out to every adversary, who may choose to use it, an opportunity of chiding you as I do now?

But it may be said, “a particular absolution “is given to him who has made a particular confession:”—true, it is enjoined in the Rubric, that after what has preceded, if the sick man humbly and heartily desire it, the priest shall absolve him in the form annexed, a form, the meaning of which, if it be ambiguous, must be understood from comparison with the express doctrine, and uniform practice, of our Church, in all the preceding instances. But even in

this very form there is an implied declaration of the nature of the absolving power ; it is given “ to absolve all sinners who truly repent and “ believe in our Lord Jesus Christ ;” and therefore on the penitent’s “ *humbly and heartily desiring it*” (the very terms imply the sincerity both of his repentance and his faith) the Priest feels himself at liberty to use it, and to say “ By Christ’s authority committed to me,” an authority the limits of which have been just before stated, “ I absolve thee from all thy sins, “ in the name of the Father, and of the Son, “ and of the Holy Ghost.” Need I add, that it is immediately followed by a prayer to God “ to “ consider the sick penitent’s contrition, to accept his tears, to assuage his grief as shall seem “ to the Divine Wisdom most expedient for him ? Would this be consistent with a *judicial* absolution already given to the penitent ? We have seen then, Sir, the real meaning of that absolution, which you affect to believe, and persons of less information than you, really believe, the same with that which is claimed and exercised by the priesthood of the Church of Rome. It has been explained by reference to clearer and more express declarations of our absolving power ; and if you will not take our assertions of the meaning of a part of our own Liturgy,

(particularly when our explanation rests on the uniform analogy of our doctrine on this particular,)—with what right, I had almost said, with what face, can we be asked to understand (as yet we are unwilling to understand, on the declaration of your Church) the language of your own Indulgences, which grant to those who acquire them “pardon of all their sins,” to mean no more than a remission of the temporal punishment still due to sins which have been remitted before?

But, even if the power of absolution exercised in our office of visiting the sick, were the very same with that of your priesthood, would there be no difference between claiming and exercising the power in so extreme a case, and with so much of interposed check and caution against the frequent use of it, that it very rarely indeed is in fact exercised,—and that doctrine of yours, which requires your people to have recourse to it at least once in every year, and makes it (I repeat) even indispensably necessary to salvation?

Before I quit the subject of this letter, I must not forget to remark on one particular, which is urged against us, not only by you,* but by

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 107. note.

many others. We are often reminded, that “to encourage the secret confession of sins;” “the Church of England has made a Canon, “requiring her Ministers not to reveal the “same.” It is most true; and, if no Canon had been made, I trust there are few Ministers of that Church, of whom it would be suspected, that under any circumstances, or by the threat of any earthly punishment, they could be induced to publish what was confided to them under that most sacred seal.* I am aware, that, some few years ago, this Canon was recited in the House of Commons, to prove, forsooth, that because there was a secret confession in the Church of England, as well as in that of Rome, therefore, the doctrine, if not the practice, of both must be in this particular the same. It might as well have been argued, that because there was a Parliament in England, and a Parliament in Paris, therefore the powers and functions of the one must have been the same as those of the other. Yet several honourable Members expressed their astonishment at the wondrous discovery; and one, in particular, from whom, of all present, it was least to be expected, exclaimed, in a paroxysm of jealousy

* See Supplemental Letter.

for the honour of our Church, that “it must be
“ a Canon of the Church of Rome.”

Of that honourable assembly, to which I have here alluded, I trust that I shall not be thought likely to speak in terms of purposed disrespect. But I may without offence be permitted to observe, that the Reports of what passes in its deliberations on subjects like those, which I am now treating, do not always tend to heighten our veneration for it. If “there is no royal road to
“ Philosophy,” neither is there any Parliamentary short-cut in the science of Divinity:—here Privilege is of no further use, than to enable its possessors to speak peremptorily in a high place, without always “knowing what they say, or
“ whereof they affirm;” in short, “honourable
“ members,” and even “honourable and learned
“ members,” must be content to be ignorant, where they will not take the trouble to be informed; and if they think fit to proclaim their ignorance, they have only to thank themselves for any exposure to which it subjects them. I will not mention names:—that is unnecessary. But we read in the Newspapers, not many weeks ago, that an honourable and learned Gentleman, arguing in favour of what is called Catholic Emancipation, was pleased to say,
“ we have heard much of Auricular Confession;

“ and no man could doubt the perversion that
 “ was made of that religious rite. Would it be
 “ believed, that, though disused in the Re-
 “ formed Church, the Canon, and the words of
 “ Absolution, were *the same as is practised in the*
 “ *Church of Rome?* So would it be disused in the
 “ Catholic, if your degrading qualification did
 “ not interfere.”

On another recent occasion, an Honourable
 (not, I believe, a learned) Gentleman, said, that
 “ he wished to advert to another point, upon
 “ which a serious error prevailed in this coun-
 “ try:—he meant the impression, that the Ro-
 “ man Catholic Clergy were in the habit of
 “ forgiving sin. *He assured the House, there*
 “ *was not a more fallacious idea. The Catholic*
 “ *Priests, in giving what was called Absolution,*
 “ *did nothing more than was done by the Arch-*
 “ *bishop of Canterbury upon similar occasions:*
 “ *(Hear, hear, hear,): aye, and in precisely the*
 “ *same words, too! that is to say, they promise*
 “ *forgiveness to those who declare themselves peni-*
 “ *tent, and express a wish and hope to be forgiven.*
 “ That forgiveness was pronounced by the Pro-
 “ testant and Roman-Catholic Clergy precisely
 “ in the same words and *in the same spirit*!”*

* While this sheet was in the hands of the Printer, a debate has occurred, in which this point has been still more gravely

maintained, and by higher authority. In particular, one Right Honourable Gentleman, who is hailed by universal acclamation as the brightest ornament of the House, is reported to have thus expressed himself: "There is a sentence in our own "Prayer-Book for the Visitation of the Sick, where the very "same doctrine is asserted in the very same words, as those "stated by Dr. Doyle before the Committee," on which statement of Dr. Doyle, as containing an accurate and full account of the doctrine of the Roman-Catholics, he had previously expressed his entire and confident reliance. I will not argue this question again, nor restate the doctrine of the Church of England, but I must seriously deplore the mischief likely to arise from all this rashness, and must venture earnestly to entreat Honourable Members to forbear making such matters the subject of Parliamentary discussion, as long as they think it so little necessary to be accurately acquainted with them. Can it be borne in mind, that what is said in Parliament, particularly by the very distinguished individual to whom I have last alluded, is not only read with eagerness in every village in the kingdom, but is circulated abroad, and preserved at home, as among the most valuable materials of history? Will it do honour either to the Speaker, or to the Church of which he is a member, that such statements of her supposed doctrine on the most important practical point on which she is opposed to the Church of Rome, should have been made by him in so high a place and on so grave an occasion?

While I am on this subject, I shall not scruple to illustrate the value of Parliamentary Investigations of religious matters by reference to the evidence taken before the Committee of the Upper House, on this very Office for "the Visitation of the "Sick." Dr. Doyle (there a *sworn* witness) is asked, and answers the following questions.

Q. Are you acquainted with the Service for the Sick in the Common Prayer Book of the Established Church? A. Yes.

Q. In that service, where a Protestant applies for the Special Interference of Providence for the relief of the Sick Person, where no human help can avail, does he appear to you to ask for more than has been granted, in your opinion, in the case of Prince Hohenloe?

A. Precisely the same; but in the case of Prince Hohenloe it was granted in a more special and striking degree.—*Report of Lords' Committee*, p. 399.

Now will it be believed, that *there actually is no such prayer in our Office?* that, on the contrary, *instead of making any supplication for the special interference of Providence, there is the most marked and guarded abstinence from such a petition?* This shall be proved by producing the real prayer itself—one of the most touching ever composed by man. It may serve, besides, as the best illustration of the real doctrine of the church of England respecting the spiritual state of the sick, and the true grounds of their hopes of pardon from God: it will, in short, put to shame, if any thing can, the miserable special pleading, which has been employed, to prove that Confession and Absolution, with us, are the same, or almost the same, as in the Church of Rome.

A Prayer for a Sick Person, when there appeareth small hope of Recovery.

“ O Father of Mercies, and God of all Comfort, our only help
 “ in time of need; we fly unto thee for succour, in behalf of
 “ this thy servant, now lying under thy hand in great weakness
 “ of body. Look graciously upon him, O Lord: and the more
 “ the outward man decayeth, strengthen him, we beseech thee,
 “ so much the more continually with thy grace and Holy Spirit
 “ in the inner man. Give him unfeigned repentance for all the
 “ errors of his life past, and stedfast faith in thy Son Jesus;
 “ that his sins may be done away by thy mercy, and his pardon
 “ sealed in heaven, before he go hence, and be no more seen.

“ We know, O Lord, that there is no word impossible with
 “ Thee; and that, if Thou wilt, Thou canst yet raise him up,
 “ and grant him a longer continuance amongst us: Yet, for-
 “ asmuch as in all appearance the time of his dissolution draw-
 “ eth near, so fit and prepare him, we beseech Thee, against
 “ the hour of death, that after his departure hence in peace,
 “ and in thy favour, his soul may be received into thine ever-
 “ lasting kingdom, through the merits and mediation of Jesus
 “ Christ, thine only Son, our Lord and Saviour.”

This Prayer is, by implication, treated by the Committee of
 the House of Lords, as the same with the mummerly of Prince
 Hohenloe! and is expressly pronounced by Dr. Doyle, *on his*
Oath, to be (as far as regards its petition) *precisely the same!*

LETTER X.

On the supposed legal necessity of a Minister of the Church of England giving evidence in a Court of Justice of what has been confided to him in Confession.

It is not very long ago, since we were told in the Report of a Trial at Law, that a learned Judge permitted an obiter dictum to fall from him, of which I may be allowed to say that it filled the breast of many a true friend of our Church with pain and amazement. Besides expressing a very strong opinion against the propriety of confidential communications, especially between clergymen and accused or suspected persons, and saying that nothing of such confidence is recognised in the doctrine of the Church of England, whatever might be the case in the Roman Communion, (in all which I sincerely believe there must have been some very gross error in the report)—he is said to have intimated, that the law of England does not protect the Priesthood of its own Church from the necessity of disclosing in evidence what has been confided to them under the seal of Confession.

As this was, I repeat, merely an *obiter dictum*, not a point deliberately ruled, I trust I shall not be deemed presumptuous, if I submit one or two considerations, which make me hope, that, if the matter ever come to be formally adjudged, the decision must be different.

In its consequences to your Priesthood, I feel no exultation. It is, I conceive, clearly and undeniably just, that they, too, should be protected. To enforce the opposite opinion,—which, however, has been ruled in Ireland, and doubtless soundly ruled, to be the law of the land,*—would be the most grievous act of persecution that could be inflicted, not on your Priest only, but also on your People. They are bound by the strongest obligations of their religion, to confess their sins; and if the sins so confessed are charged on them as crimes, they are, in fact, punished by human judicatures for obedience to the demands of religion in a point by no means criminal. The law, whilst it disclaims and discourages every mode of seeking confession, would in that case make use of the most powerful of all instruments even to extort it. Still, with all this evil annexed to it, I apprehend that the principle in the law of evi-

* See Starkie's Law of Evidence.

dence, which recognizes no ground of privileged communication, but the confidence between attorney and client, and the public policy of the land,—leaves your Priesthood quite unprotected; while the ground on which I should venture to submit, that the Clergy of the Church of England are protected, does not extend to yours.

The dictum of the learned Judge, to which I have alluded, is understood to rest on a case cited in Peake's N. P. C. 3 Ed. p. 108. *Du Barrè v. Livette*. On that occasion, a case, *K. v. Sparkes*, was quoted as having occurred on the Northern Circuit before Mr. J. Buller; but of which I am enabled by one of the Counsel for the Prisoner to state, that the facts were materially different from the statement given in Peake. They were briefly as follows:—The Prisoner, who was charged with murder at the assizes for Northumberland, in 1787, was a Member of the Church of England (not a Papist, as the case states) who had gone to a Clergyman of his own Church, and confessed to him. That Clergyman was afterwards required to give evidence of the Confession, and an objection to it taken by the Prisoner's Counsel was overruled by Mr. J. Wilson, (before whom, not Mr. J. Buller, the case was tried,) after consulting

with the other Judge of Assize, the late Lord *Loughborough*. When this case was quoted in *Du Barrè v. Livette*, Lord *Kenyon* said, "It is sufficient for me, sitting here, to say, that this case materially differs from that cited; but *I should have paused, before I admitted the evidence there received.* The case, as it respects the Judge who determined it, is entitled to every attention from me: but this case differs from it."* Such an intimation of Lord *Kenyon's* opinion will be a sufficient excuse for me, in presuming to think, that the late dictum may, perhaps, be found to be not entirely well-grounded.

But against the application of the general principle of the law of Evidence to confession made to a Priest, however I may lament it, however I may think, (as I certainly do think,) that substantial justice would require, that this also be a privileged communication, I do not venture to argue. It is on a special ground of

* His Lordship, on the supposition of the prisoner having been (as was erroneously stated in the case cited to him) a Papist, proceeded to say, "*The Popish religion is now unknown to the law of this country,*" implying, I submit, that if it were known to the law, its ordinances would be recognized; and, consequently, that the religion of the Church of England being known to the law, its ordinances must be admitted and sanctioned by it.

law in our case, which appears to have been not adverted to in the argument before Mr. J. Wilson, that I would rest our claim to protection. *The Liturgy and Rubrics of the Church of England* are,—(I will not say, part of the law of the land; that might be going too far; though that, I believe, has been said,—but they are) not merely recognized by it, as containing nothing but what is true, and enjoining nothing but what is fit,—they are regarded by the law as pointing out, in all particulars included in them, the real duty of Christians. The 13th and 14th Charles II. c. 4. enjoins the use of the Book of Common Prayer “to the intent that every Person in this realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public Worship, and administration of Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England.” Now, we have already seen, that, in certain circumstances, the Rubric, thus highly sanctioned, enjoins secret Confession to a Priest, as a part of Christian Duty, and that the Liturgy, in another place, specially invites the penitent to similar confession. Does, then, the Law of England subject to civil mischiefs of the gravest kind those who comply with what it admits to be their duty as Christians, because they comply with it? Is it thus, that the great boast of

Englishmen is realized, that Christianity is part of the common law of the land?

But this is not all. If the Clergyman is bound to reveal in Evidence what has been communicated to him in Confession, he is also bound to reveal it, in case of felony, without waiting to be summoned as a witness at all. If he does not, he is guilty of misprision of felony.* Will a principle, drawing this monstrous consequence after it, be maintained? Shall the Clergyman be subjected to fine and imprisonment for not disclosing to man, what the law of God commands him to conceal? But to this extent the principle, if it be a sound one, must be confessed to lead.

On these accounts, with the highest respect for the quarter from which the late dictum proceeded, I venture to protest against it,—to say that, while I trust, if such be the law, no minister of the Church of England would feel himself at liberty to comply with it, I at the same time cannot but indulge a hope, that the dictum itself will be found erroneous.

But, I return to my discussions with you.

* 4 Blackstone, 121. This liability to an Indictment for Misprision of Felony would, perhaps, justify a refusal to answer any question of the kind supposed. But most of my Brethren would probably decline to rest their refusal on such a plea.

LETTER XI.

Augustine and Pelagius.

YOUR next subject is one with which I shall not harass myself. The merits of the dispute between Augustine and Pelagius have no immediate or close connection with our main enquiry ; nor do they admit of being discussed with tolerable accuracy in a short or hasty manner. But it would be uncandid in me to dissemble, that I think you have here a manifest advantage. I think Mr. Southey's judgment on the questions between them erroneous, or, at the best, very incomplete, in one main particular, the free-will of man ; if that free-will be understood by him to include (as Mr. Southey's language would lead us to suppose) the power of " turning to God," and " working righteousness," without any *internal* succours of the divine Spirit. That Mr. Southey has not expressly assented to Pelagius's notions on this head, is very true ; but that he has not expressly condemned them, when brought immediately under his review, is, I think, to be

lamented:—The more so, because the very handsome terms, in which he speaks of Pelagius, might lead to the inference, (which yet, I am persuaded, would not be true,) that in the chief part of his doctrine he considers him to have been right.

Of Augustine I will only say, that for talents and learning, for honesty, sincerity, and candour; for meekness, and, in the main,* for charity; for Christian zeal and devotion to the cause of Truth, he is entitled to higher praise, than it is here necessary to give. That notwithstanding all these high qualities, he fell into more dangerous errors than almost any other Father of the Church, is only a lamentable instance of the infirmity of “poor human nature.” Bonum virum facîle dixerim, magnum libentèr.

* I say, *in the main*; because I cannot join you in giving unqualified praise for charity to the author of the following sentence, which is, however, made part of your Holy Canons. Decret. Greg. l. v. tit. 7.

Firmissimè tene, et nullatenùs dubites, omnem hæreticum vel schismaticum cum diabolo et angelis ejus æterni ignis incendio participandum, nisi ante finem vitæ Catholicæ fuerit incorporatus et redintegratus ecclesiæ. Aug. de Fide Cath.

LETTER XII.

Transubstantiation—Real Presence as maintained by the Church of England. Test Act. Adoration of the Host.

OF the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, it is no part of my present business to treat. And I am glad that it is not; for I could have no hope of setting in a new or clearer light a question, which for centuries has been discussed by the ablest and most learned of men. Happily, too, I have in this instance no reason to complain of any wish on the part of yourself, or Dr. Milner, to disguise or dissemble the doctrine of your Church. Here, therefore, it might be expected that I should have nothing left to do: but this, I am sorry to say, is far from being the case. Your and your reverend friend's labours on this subject will give me some trouble; and not least in endeavouring to discover what you are both about. You applaud him to the very Echo for the great ability he has shewn in choosing and maintaining his ground. "I do in my heart love a strong

“argument,” you exclaim, and you point to the object of your ardent love in the letters of Dr. Milner in his *End of Controversy** on the subject of Transubstantiation. Now, Sir, of the sincerity of this love of yours, I have not the smallest doubt: I only marvel at the singular manner in which it displays itself. So Platonic an affection was, I verily believe, never before exhibited. You not only seek no enjoyment of the object of your love, but you actually run away from it, and never once treat yourself with even a sidelong glance. In plain truth, you do not seem to know what it really is.

The main part of Dr. Milner's letters on this subject is directed to shew, that the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is real, not figurative. “This being determined,” says he, “it will be time enough, and, in my opinion, it will not require a long time, to conclude upon the manner of his presence, whether by Consubstantiation, or Transubstantiation.”† He then says, what amounts to this, that “the language of the Church of England is

* “Book of the Roman-Catholic Church,” &c. p. 116. where there is also reference to two other works of Dr. Milner, of which I know nothing.

† *End of Controversy*, p. 268.

“ chosen for the purpose of disguising its real
 “ sentiments, and making it be believed that
 “ she holds the doctrine of the Real Pre-
 “ sence, while, in fact, *it is certain and con-*
 “ *fessed that she does not.*” These are the points
 Dr. Milner undertakes to prove; and which
 we must suppose, from the way in which you
 extol his argument, you think that he has
 succeeded in proving. These, therefore, one
 would expect, are also the points, which, if
 you thought it needless again to prove them,
 you would at least make the basis of your own
 observations. But no such thing. Your argu-
 ment (as in courtesy, I suppose, it must be
 called) proceeds on a supposition the very
 contrary to Dr. Milner’s, namely, that the
 doctrine of the real presence *is* the doctrine of
 the Church of England: for you say, that “ *no*
 “ *Protestant who believes the real presence (and*
 “ *all Protestants of the established Church of*
 “ *England profess to believe it)* can conscien-
 “ tiously swear, or even simply affirm, ‘ that
 “ ‘ there is no Transubstantiation in the Eu-
 “ ‘ charist.’ ”

I hope, Sir, you will forgive me, I am sure
 my readers will, if after this I do not think it
 necessary to follow you regularly through your
 discussion of this point. I leave you in the

hands of your own master, Dr. Milner. He was wont, in olden times, to call you a “ smatterer “ in Theology:” how far he thinks you improved, since you have put yourself under his tuition, I do not know. But at all events, I trust you will find him merciful in his discipline.

The course which I shall adopt, is, first, to disentangle the question from the sophisms on which Dr. Milner’s arguments rest; and then to state the doctrine of the Church of England respecting the real presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. I shall afterwards notice certain collateral points introduced by you and Dr. Milner, and more especially some of your and his citations of authorities.

First, then, Dr. Milner’s argument rests on two sophisms, which it will be found worth while to expose, as they are commonly adopted by the modern advocates of your Church.

The first is a *petitio principii*; he begs, or, rather, he boldly runs away with, the very matter in dispute. He assumes that *the real presence* is, and can only be, the corporal and material presence of the crucified Saviour; such a presence as can only be effected by changing the sacramental Elements into the body and blood of Christ, or by making both substances to be united in one: whereas, as

shall be shewn presently, and as Dr. Milner perfectly well knows, the Church of England holds *a real presence* of a very different kind.

The other sophism rests on an ambiguous meaning of the word *Sacrament*; a word sometimes, and more strictly, applied to the sign, or matter, sometimes to the whole sacred rite. Now, it is in the former sense, that the Church of Rome holds *the real presence* of the body and blood of Christ *in the Sacrament*; it is in the latter that the real presence in the Sacrament, maintained by the Church of England, must be sought. The Church of Rome holds that the body and blood of Christ are present under the accidents of bread and wine; the Church of England holds that their real presence is in the *Soul of the Communicant* at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Having thus cleared our way, I proceed to state more fully what is indeed the doctrine of our Church on this subject. She holds then, that after the consecration of the bread and wine they are changed not in their nature but in their *use*; that instead of nourishing our bodies only, they now are instruments by which, when worthily received, God gives to our souls the body and blood of Christ to nourish and sustain them: that this is not a fictitious, or imaginary, exhibi-

tion of our crucified Redeemer to us, but a real though spiritual one, more real, indeed, because more effectual, than the carnal exhibition and manducation of him could be, (for the flesh profiteth nothing.) In the same manner, then, as our Lord himself said, "I am the *true* bread "that came down from heaven," (not meaning thereby that he was a lump of baked dough, or manna, but the true means of sustaining the true life of man, which is spiritual, not corporeal,) so, in the sacrament, to the worthy receiver of the consecrated elements, though in their nature mere bread and wine, are yet given truly, really, and effectively, the crucified body and blood of Christ; that body and blood which were the instruments of man's redemption, and upon which our spiritual life and strength solely depend. It is in this sense that the crucified Jesus is present in the sacrament of his supper, not in, nor with, the bread and wine, nor under their accidents, but in the souls of communicants; not carnally, but effectually and fruitfully, and therefore most really.*

* That this is the doctrine of our Church on the real presence, I prove by reference to these words of the twenty-eighth article, "To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, "receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking "of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing

Having thus stated the doctrine of our Church, I proceed to other matters, to the citations of authorities by Dr. Milner and yourself. And, first, respecting the real presence, “the main point under consideration,” (Dr. Milner tells us*). He names three witnesses from among the divines of our Church, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Cosin, and Hooker, “*the testimonies of whom for the real presence,*” (of course he must mean the real presence acknowledged by his own Church,) “*are as explicit as Catholics*

“is a partaking of the Blood of Christ;”—to the Church Catechism, “The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper,” and “the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine:” also to the Communion service, “Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood; and that he may evermore dwell in us, and we in him:”—to the words of the administering the sacrament, “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee—the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee — preserve thy body and soul unto eternal life:”—lastly to the thanksgiving after receiving it, “We most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby, that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son.”

* p. 273.

“ *themselves can wish them to be.*” “ *The near or rather the close approach of these, and other eminent Protestant Divines, to the constant doctrine of the Catholic Church on this principal subject of modern controversy, is evidently to be ascribed to the perspicuity and force of the declaration of Holy Scripture.*” After this opening speech, he calls his witnesses; the first is Archbishop Bramhall, who writes thus: “ No genuine son of the Church (of England) did ever deny a true real presence. Christ said *this is my body*, and what he said we stedfastly believe. He said neither CON NOR SUB NOR TRANS: therefore *we place these among the opinions of schools, not among articles of faith.*” *

I know not what your experience of your reverend friend may enable you to believe respecting him; but my readers in general will hardly suppose it possible, that the words which he has had the confidence to cite as a proof of Archbishop Bramhall’s “ near or rather close approach to the constant doctrine of your Church,” are *part of a sentence written professedly against transubstantiation*, and that in the original it stands as follows: “ Having viewed all your strength with a single eye,

* Answer to De la Militière, p. 15.

“ I find not one of your arguments, that comes to transubstantiation, but only to a true real presence, which no genuine son of the Church did ever deny.—Christ said,” &c.

The next is Bishop Cosin. He is declared by Dr. Milner to be *“ not less explicit in favor of the Catholic doctrine.”* He says, *“ It is a monstrous error to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist. We confess the necessity of a supernatural and heavenly change, and that the signs cannot become sacraments but by the infinite power of God. If any one make a bare figure of the sacrament, we ought not to suffer him in our Churches.”** Why, Sir, there is not a syllable in all this, which carries Dr. Milner a single step on his way to prove that Bishop Cosin thought with the Church of Rome on any point contested with her by the Church of England. Who among us denies, that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist? or the necessity of a supernatural and heavenly change? or that signs can become sacraments only by the infinite power of God? What member of the Church of England would be acknowledged by his Church in making a bare figure of the

* Hist. of Transubstantiation.

sacrament? Again, Cosin is quoted in another place* as saying “ Christ is present *really and substantially* by an incomprehensible mystery.” Why, so he is; and so we have shewn that the Church of England maintains, understanding *substantially* to mean, what Cosin (if indeed he has used the word† as quoted) must intend it to mean, not carnally or corporeally, but in power and effect, in rei veritate, not by fiction. For thus, in the same tract, he writes expressly,‡

“ The divines of the reformed Church think
 “ very differently from the Church of Rome
 “ on the subject of transubstantiation. But
 “ *all change* of the bread into the body of
 “ Christ (and of the wine in like manner into
 “ his blood) *no protestant absolutely denies*. For
 “ they know and admit that the bread in the
 “ Eucharist is by the force of the words and
 “ benediction of Christ entirely changed in its
 “ *condition, use, and office*, that is, instead of
 “ being common and ordinary, it is made to us
 “ mystical and sacramental food; by which all
 “ affirm and confidently believe, that the real
 “ body of Christ is not merely signified, or

* End of Controversy, p. 266.

† I say this, because I cannot find it in the page 44, to which Dr. Milner refers, nor in any other.

‡ p. 38.

“ shadowed out by a figure, but is also in very
“ deed at the same time exhibited, and is re-
“ ceived in the souls of those who worthily
“ communicate. Meanwhile, that the bread
“ loses its substance and passes into the sub-
“ stance of Christ’s body, they by no means
“ believe; since neither Scripture, nor the an-
“ cient Interpreters of Scripture, for many
“ ages, have ever transmitted to us the notion
“ of such a conversion or essential transmuta-
“ tion, by which the substance, that is, the
“ matter and form of the bread, would be lost;
“ but *only a sacramental and mystic change*, so
“ that it is destined to another office, use, and
“ end; a change, indeed, according with the
“ divine grace as well as power, which does
“ not abolish, but *preserves the natural essence of*
“ *things, and uses it to supernatural effects.*”

In short, if I were to quote all that Cosin says in this tract against the doctrine of the Church of Rome, in favour of which he is cited as a witness, I should transcribe the whole of it. Let me only add one brief sentence more, on the notion that difficulties respecting the possibility of Transubstantiation may be answered by considering the power of God. “ We decline,” says he, “ considering what
“ God *can* do: for we ought to be assured re-

“specting his *will*, before we trouble ourselves
 “with enquiring about his *power*. This, how-
 “ever, we say, that this *Transubstantiation of*
 “*the Romans is a sort of portent, which exceeds*
 “*the nature of all miracles.*” *

The last witness called to this point by Dr. Milner, is “the justly esteemed divine,” “the profound Hooker.” For he too, we are told, makes “a near or rather close approach to the doctrine of your Church.” “I wish men would give themselves more to meditate, with silence, on what we have in the sacrament, and less to dispute of the matter *how*. Sith we all agree that Christ, by the sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by Consubstantiation, or else by Transubstantiation?” †

Why, Sir, this advice is exactly what the Church of England has shewn its earnest desire to follow. It has sought to include in its communion all who will regard Transubstantiation, and Consubstantiation, only as specula-

* Hoc tamen dicimus, Transubstantiationem istam Romanam genus esse portenti, quod omnium superat miraculorum indolem.

† Ecc. Pol. b. v. 7.

tive matters, not as points of faith. Yet would one not suppose, from Dr. Milner's language, as well as yours, that the very reverse has been the case? that the conduct of our Church on this particular has been all fire and fury, and that of yours all meekness and forbearance? Whereas, in truth, the most our Church says against Transubstantiation, (a very different thing from the adoration of the host,) is merely, that it "cannot be proved by holy writ, but "is repugnant to the plain words of scripture; "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and "hath given rise to many superstitions."*

And now, will you or Dr. Milner, who has thus insinuated that the Church of Rome is so very gentle in its doctrine respecting Transubstantiation, and ours so very violent, tell us what that Church really has said and done, on the same occasion? I am afraid I must tell it for you, and must go to the Council of Trent for the purpose. In the first chapter, then, of its decree de Eucharistiâ, it speaks of the denial of this doctrine as an act of the "*most flagitious* "kind,"† and adds that "the church, the pil-

* 28th article.

† Sess. xiii. c. 1. Indignissimum sane flagitium est ea a quibusdam contentiosis et pravis hominibus ad fictitios et imaginarios tropos, quibus veritas carnis et sanguinis Christi negatur,

“lar and ground of the truth, has detested as
 “ *satanical*, these false opinions excogitated by
 “ *impious* men.” This, one would think, is
 going far enough: but the holy Fathers are not
 yet satisfied: they pronounce an anathema* on
 “ all who hold that Christ is present in the
 “ sacrament, as in a sign, or figure, or even (as
 “ the Church of England holds) *virtute*,” that
 is, effectually and virtually.

But, whatever be the moderation of our
 Church on this subject, the Law of the Land,
 you tell us,† requires a declaration upon Oath,
 that *Transubstantiation is idolatrous*. The law
 of the land does no such thing; and so you
 ought to have known, before you thought fit to
 publish and republish such an assertion. The
 law requires no more respecting Transubstan-
 tiation, than a simple denial of it upon Oath.
 Here then, all your idle talk, (I hope it deserves
 no harsher name,) about the Lutherans, and
 “ all who maintain the doctrine of the real
 “ presence, whether Protestants or Roman-
 “ Catholics,” being on our principle idolaters,

contra universum Ecclesiæ sensum detorqueri; quæ tanquam
 columna et firmamentum veritatis hæc ab impiis hominibus
 excogitata commenta, velut satanica, detestata est.

* Can. 1.

† Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 323.

comes absolutely to nothing. "We may ask," you say, "whether, if idolatry be chargeable on transubstantiation, it be not chargeable, with equal justice, on consubstantiation and impanation, one or other of which is maintained in every Protestant creed?"

When you address the public on grave subjects, and require that your voice should be heard in the deliberations of our statesmen, it is not too much to expect, that you should give yourself the trouble of understanding your own words. Were you dreaming when you wrote this sentence? and has your dream been unbroken from the year 1821, when we first heard of it, to the present hour? Do you know the meaning of the word impanation? I hope not: for, if you do, my next question must be more distressing to you, than an imputation of ignorance. Do you know a single Protestant Church which includes *impanation* in its creed? Again, do you know what consubstantiation means? If you do, do you know what your own words mean, when you say, that "either consubstantiation or impanation is maintained in every Protestant creed?" Is the Church of England a Protestant Church? Is the creed of the reformed in France a Protestant creed? Are the followers of Calvin, the various Churches which

they founded, and the creeds which they have set forth, are they, I ask, Protestant? If they are, what becomes of your precious question? *Does any one of them maintain either Consubstantiation or Impanation?*—And yet it is on such gossip as this, that the legislature is expected to repeal our laws, and the people are required to consider their creed as almost the same with your own.

Dr. Milner is not so inconsiderate; he pursues the more specious course of complaining of the injustice of our statesmen in “directing all the severity of the law”* against so innocent a dogma, as that of transubstantiation. The fallacy of this way of stating the case, though sometimes adopted by those who ought to know better,† has been so often refuted, as hardly to

* End of Controversy, p. 268.

† In the recent debate of the 21st April, that Right Hon. Gentleman, to whom I have before alluded, did not think it beneath him to stoop to this egregious trifling.—It is with regret I add, that the same eminent person fell into the snare, even while he abjured and ridiculed it, of talking, and (as on those occasions seems almost equivalent to talking) of blundering, on questions of Theology. Let him applaud the abilities and honour of Dr. Doyle as he will. Did he seriously suppose, that he would have an adequate notion of the real state of the matters controverted between the Churches of England and of Rome, from the statement of this very adroit advocate, on one side,

need to be again exposed. But let me briefly say, that the law does not exclude you and your

with no one to sift it, no one to elicit the Truth, but the members of a Committee of the House of Commons? The error, into which he was thus led on the subject of Confession and Absolution, we have already seen.

To his remarks on the intolerant Spirit of our Church, as proved by its retaining the Athanasian Creed, I presume to answer, first, by referring to what is said on that Creed below—see App. p. 368; secondly, by expressing my surprize, that such a mind as his could condescend to argue such a question in the tone of an advocate at Nisi Prius, instead of meeting the real practical difference, in that spirit, which is so eminently his own, the spirit of a Statesman. The only point worthy of his notice, the only thing really bearing on the great question before the House, was this: “Is there any thing so exclusive
“and intolerant in the principles and sentiments of Roman-
“Catholics, as to make them unfit to legislate for Protestants,
“particularly in those matters, which are often the subject of
“legislative deliberation, relative to Religion and to the Church,
“and to the connection of the Church with the State, at pre-
“sent admitted to be essential to the Constitution?”

In proof of the affirmative, it is not necessary to go to the decisions of Councils, that no man can be saved out of the pale of the Church of Rome, nor to any dogmatic decrees (which are however sufficiently abundant—for not a single article of faith is ever affirmed by that Church without excluding from salvation all who deny it)—but to these it is not necessary to have recourse. The Right Hon. Gent. had only to open the evidence of his friend Dr. Doyle, before the Committee of the House of Lords, p. 238, and he would find that Divine admitting, though with evident embarrassment, that “*the doctrine*

brethren from any privileges, *because* you believe in transubstantiation, but because you belong

“ of exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome is preached in Ireland by the Parochial Clergy to their flocks.” He might also have found, from the evidence of Mr. Burnett, p. 308, a friend of Catholic Emancipation,” that “ he had heard this “ doctrine preached frequently”—and that “ he thought the “ general religious effect upon their minds, when they come to “ the question, is, that *their Protestant Neighbour is in a state of “ perdition.*” The very Catechism (Butler’s) recommended by the Roman-Catholic Metropolitan of Ireland as “ a general “ Catechism for the kingdom,” teaches the same thing—“ No “ one can be saved out of the true Church,” p. 16, that true Church, which is called “ Roman, because its visible head is “ Bishop of Rome, the Pope, Christ’s Vicar upon earth.” p. 17.

Such is the feeling on this point among the Irish Roman-Catholics, infused into them from their earliest childhood, and strengthened by all the Spiritual instruction given to them through life. Now what is the feeling of Protestants on the same point ? Did the Right Hon. Gentleman, or any Gentleman, ever know similar, or any thing like similar, doctrine taught by the ministers of the Church of England ? Or is there a single member of either House of Parliament, who will rise in his place, and say, that the doctrine of exclusive salvation, in any sense, that bears on this political question, is believed by the members of our Church ? While such is the real practical difference between the two Churches, the only point deserving the attention of the Legislature, is it worthy of a great Statesman to have recourse to a mere “ windy war of words ” on the greatest constitutional question, which has been argued within the walls of Parliament since the Revolution ?

In truth, the Church of England, in separating from that of

to a Church whose principles are considered to be such as render it inexpedient to suffer its

Rome, *rejected all these dogmas of exclusive salvation*, though it did not at the same time reject that ancient Creed, to which certain propositions are appended—(I say appended, for they are no part of the Creed itself)—which, however harsh they may sound, admit of being fairly understood in a true and charitable sense.

Dr. Doyle indeed says, and says it on his Oath, (but here the Right Hon. Gentleman parts company with him,) that “ he thinks the doctrine of exclusive salvation is found as “ expressly stated in our 18th Article, as in any of the *Creeds* “ of his Church.” p. 238. Whether he has used the word *Creeds* in order to provide himself with a retreat, in case he should be pressed on tenets not expressed in *Creeds*, I do not enquire. But for the 18th Article I also refer to the Appendix, p. 370. And I conclude what I have to say on my present subject with an appeal to experience. The real difference of the Church of Rome and of our own, in respect to exclusive salvation, is clearly shewn in that which is, I believe, the most common, and, with weak minds, most successful argument for conversion to the former:—namely, “ that such “ a conversion is, at any rate, the safer course; for Protestants “ themselves admit that Roman-Catholics may be saved,— “ whereas, the Church of Rome contends, that all must be “ damned, who do not embrace its faith after it has been “ sufficiently proposed to them.” See Controversy between Knott and Chillingworth.

After this, it is not pleasant to be obliged to remark, that *Dr. Doyle has said on his Oath* (ubi supra) that “ he does not “ suppose there is any difference between one Church and “ another, in preaching the doctrine of exclusive salvation.”—

members to sit in Parliament: and it prescribes the denial of transubstantiation only as a *test*, to ascertain whether those who are required to take it do indeed belong to that Church. It is “an act for the more effectual preserving the King’s person and government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament.”

Whether such exclusion, or such a test, be indeed necessary, is no part of the subject I have undertaken to treat. But I may be allowed to say, that, as a test, nothing could be better chosen, than the denial of transubstantiation. It is a dogma so intimately interwoven in the system of your Church, that no man can pretend to belong to you, who has cast off that most essential article of your peculiar creed. For this reason,—that is, because I think it apparent that a denial of transubstantiation is a sufficient test,—I sincerely lament that any other was ever chosen; much more one marked by so much needless acrimony of invective, as the other parts of the declaration exhibit. That there were circumstances in the History of the time when that declaration was pre-

On this I will only say, that I heartily wish him to have the benefit of any plea, which can be found in the nature of his examination, and of the points on which he was examined.

scribed, which account for the harsh language in which it is drawn, does not diminish the regret which moderate men must feel and express, that its tone has not long ago been reduced to a point more accordant with Charity. Surely, the defenders of the continued necessity of a test would not have found their task more difficult, if it had been no longer encumbered with any remnants of the violence and frenzy of an age, on which no Englishman can look back without shame.

But wholly unnecessary to the purposes of a test, as the introduction of the other propositions appear, their truth I deem to be of main importance to pure religion. This, however, is a point which I do not mean to argue here; I shall confine myself to an examination of your and Dr. Milner's allegation of Protestant evidence to the contrary, as far, at least, as relates to the Idolatry charged to be practised in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The first witness called by Dr. Milner* is "the learned Gunning, Bishop of Ely."—Now *he subscribed the Test*,† and thereby proclaimed his belief that your Church is guilty.

* End of Controversy, p. 256.

† See Letter to Earl Grey, App. p. 365.

The next is “the candid Thorndyke, Prebendary of Westminster:” he in his “Just Weights and Measures” gives evidence in your favour on this count, though he has pronounced you guilty of Idolatry on another.*

The third is “the celebrated Dr. Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down,” “than whom,” as you truly say, “the whole Protestant Church “boasts no fairer name,” “and who had fully “examined the points in question:” he, you continue to say, “declared, after his examination of them, that *the doctrine of the Catholic Church upon them is not idolatrous.*” The following is the citation made both by you and Dr. Milner. “The object (says this learned “and eloquent Prelate) of their adoration in “the Sacrament, is the only true and eternal “God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually “present under the veil of the Sacrament:— “and if they thought him not present, they are “so far from worshipping the bread, that they “profess it Idolatry to do so. This is demonstration that the Soul has nothing in it that “is idololatrical; the will has nothing in it, but “what is a great enemy to Idolatry.”

* See above, p. 53.

I shall beg leave to ask this witness a few questions.

Q. Has your Lordship spoken advisedly the words here cited, and do you mean to abide by them?

A. Most certainly; but in order that my meaning may be correctly understood, I think it right, that the occasion, on which they were spoken, and also the context, should be fully considered. They were introduced by me in “a Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying,” the object of which is professedly “to shew
“the unreasonableness of prescribing to other
“men’s faith, and *the iniquity of persecuting dif-
“fering opinions.*” In the progress of my discourse, I had to consider, (a question, which you in the 19th century will hardly believe could ever have been mooted,) whether “the precept of
“God to the Jews, that those Prophets who
“persuaded to Idolatry should be slain,”* ought to be put in force against persons “of
“the Romish religion.” It is in resisting so monstrous a notion, that my words which have been cited occur. I there shew, “that the
“object of their adoration, (that which is
“represented to them in their minds, their
“thoughts, and purposes, and by which God

* Liberty of Prophesying, sect. 20. subsect. 15.

“*principally, if not solely,*” (remember I do not say solely) “takes estimate of human actions,) “in the Sacrament is the only true God:” “and before they venture to pass an act of “adoration, they believe the bread to be annihilated, or turned into his substance who “may lawfully be worshipped; and they who “have these thoughts are as much enemies of “Idolatry, as they that understand better how “to avoid that inconvenience, which is supposed to be the crime, *which they formally hate, and we materially avoid.*”

Q. What then? your Lordship recognizes the distinction between material and formal Idolatry?

A. Rather between being materially and formally guilty of Idolatry; for in the very next sentence of my discourse I have spoken of the Romanist Teachers, only as “*not formally guilty of Idolatry,*” manifestly implying that what they do and teach *is Idolatry*: for so it must be considered by us, if we are faithful to our own principles.

Q. Has your Lordship in any other of your works, for which you have, I am happy to say, received the highest praises of the learned gentlemen on the other side, said any thing on this subject?

A. I have. In a Treatise of mine, entitled

“ The real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in
 “ the blessed Sacrament, proved against the
 “ doctrine of Transubstantiation,” I have ex-
 pressly treated “ of adoration of the Sacra-
 “ ment;” and I there say that “ since by the
 “ decree of the Council of Trent,* they are
 “ bound to exhibit to the Sacrament the same
 “ worship which they give to the true God,
 “ *either this Sacrament is Jesus Christ, or they*
 “ *are very Idolaters*; I mean *materially* such,
 “ even while, in their purposes, they decline
 “ it.”—“ If, I say, they be deceived in their
 “ own strict article, then *it is certain they com-*
 “ *mit an act of Idolatry* in giving divine honour
 “ to a mere creature.”—“ Add to this, that
 “ supposing Christ to be present in their sense,
 “ yet *as they have ordered the business, they have*
 “ *made it superstitious and idololatrical*, for they
 “ declare that the divine worship does belong
 “ also to the symbols of bread and wine, as
 “ being ‘ one with Christ;’ that even the spe-
 “ cies also with Christ are to be adored.”† And
 “ it is not imaginable how they can pass divine
 “ worship to those accidents, which are not in
 “ the body, nor the same with the body, but
 “ subsist of themselves, and yet not commit

* Sess. xiii. c. 5.

† Lib. 4. de Euch. c. 29.

“Idolatry.” I have said much more to the same effect; but perhaps this may be sufficient.

Q. It is indeed: but as your Lordship is now before us, I will avail myself of the opportunity to ask you one or two questions, on another particular connected with this subject, on which also your authority has been cited. The present Bishop of Norwich* in his arguments for the repeal of the existing statutes by which the Roman-Catholics (as we now call them) are excluded from having seats in the Legislature, and from certain offices, (he claiming such matters for them, almost as strict rights, and condemning all diminution of civil privileges, and any thing like restraint, on account of religion,) has said that “*he has not used a single argument, nor hardly a single expression, which is not to be met with (among other eminent authorities) in your Book of the Liberty of Prophecy.*” Permit me to ask, whether this is the case?

A. You could not have surprized me more than by putting this question. There are, I understand, many points in that Prelate’s opinions as well as character, in which it would be an honour to any Christian to resemble him.

* See his Lordship’s Speech, June 18, 1811.

But I must disclaim all agreement with him in this particular, which you mention. It is very true, that I have denied the right of any state to hang or burn persons of the “ Romish Religion,” on the ground of their being, as they certainly are, materially (though not formally) guilty of Idolatry: it is also true that I have said* “ *in matters merely speculative, the body politic which only may lawfully use the sword, is not a competent judge of such matters;*” that “ under this consideration come very many articles of the Church of Rome, which are wholly speculative, which do not derive upon practice, which begin in the understanding and rest there, and which therefore ought to have no effect upon the persons of men, their bodies, or their temporal condition. I instance in two, prayer for the dead and transubstantiation.” But I had before said, within two pages, that “ some† of their doctrines” are of a very different description, “ are a direct overthrow to all human society and mutual commerce, a destruction of government and of the laws—therefore those who hold and

* Sect. 20. subsect. 8. 10. 20.

† Such as that the Pope may dispense with all Oaths, may absolve subjects from their allegiance; faith is not to be kept with heretics; heretical princes may be slain by their subjects.

“ preach them cannot pretend to the excuses
“ of innocent opinions. However if it might
“ happen that men should sincerely err in such
“ plain matters of fact, (for there are fools
“ enough in the world,) yet if he hold his peace,
“ no man is *to persecute or punish him.*” This,
I suppose, is what the Bishop of Norwich means
to say is the same with his notions, especially,
as I understand, that those particular doctrines
of the Church of Rome, which I have specially
mentioned, are in your days disclaimed both in
England and in Ireland: but remember, I have
said nothing against civil disabilities applied to
persons of that Communion (in my time they
were treated more harshly); on the contrary,
I have expressly recognized the right of the
Legislature to impose them: for I have said as
“ the result of my account of what is to be done
“ in toleration of diversity of opinions: *Let the*
“ *Prince and secular power have a care the com-*
“ *monwealth be safe. For whether such or such*
“ *a sect of Christians be to be permitted,*” (and of
course how far to be permitted) “ *is a question*
“ *rather political than religious.*”

I thank your Lordship for speaking so plainly
and so much to the purpose, on this point, as
well as the other, and will not trouble you with
any more questions.

LETTER XIII.

*Archbishop Wake.—Mr. Butler's Charge on the Clergy
of our Church.*

THERE remains one other witness cited by Dr. Milner, whose testimony and the circumstances connected with it will require a more detailed consideration; I mean Archbishop Wake. His name has been more frequently brought forward by the advocates of your political cause, and his opinions more grievously perverted, than those of any other writer. Sorry, sincerely sorry I am to say, that the first who introduced the authority of Wake, as favouring the pretensions of your Church, was a Prelate of the Church of England. The Bishop of Norwich, in the same Speech in which he cited Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying," was pleased to cite also this most distinguished divine; and using terms as ample, as any of those who have succeeded him, claimed his sanction for the position, that "the religious tenets of the (Roman) Catholics" make a very near

approach to our own. With how little shadow of justice this was done, will appear presently.* Meanwhile, it is painful and mortifying to behold an amiable and charitable man, thus betrayed by the blindness of his zeal into an act as truly contrary to charity, as any that can be named. Be it his punishment to know, that (however unwittingly) he has done all within his power to blast the fair fame of one, whom he himself esteems worthy of the highest honour; and to expose the memory of a good and great man to all the scoffs and insults, which such adversaries as Dr. Milner rejoice to heap upon it. The Bishop was followed, in due time, by Sir John Hippesley†—then by Dr. Milner—and last of all by Earl Grey. To this distinguished Nobleman I ventured at the time to point out the real state of the facts of this case, being quite sure that he had been misled by others—little did I then think, who had been the prime misleader.

But it is to Dr. Milner that my present observations must be addressed. He has well merited the distinction, by the boldness with which he avails himself of the advantage so

* See also Letter to Earl Grey—App. p. 342.

† Speech in House of Commons, 24th of April, 1812.

unhappily given him.—The allegation of the Bishop of Norwich respecting Wake is greedily seized by Dr. Milner, and is made by him to serve the double purpose of strengthening his present argument, and of ministering to his hatred against one of the ablest and most triumphant opponents of his Church. Accordingly, he adduces this great Prelate's supposed concession, as a proof that he in particular, as well as all his associates and successors in that holy cause, did not seriously believe the accusations which he urged:—that he and they “wanted
“the rare grace of acknowledging their error
“at the expense of temporal advantages,” and
“had no other defence for themselves, but mis-
“representation and calumny.”

Now, Sir, let Dr. Milner first tell the world, whether he holds the doctrines ascribed to Du Pin in the Appendix to Mosheim's History,* which he quotes, and to which alone the Archbishop's concession applies:—if he does, let him also tell us, how he makes them accord with the doctrines of his Church. Will he, for instance, with Du Pin, assent to our 6th Article which affirms that “Scripture contains all things
“necessary to Salvation, so that whatsoever is

* Mosheim's History by Maclaine, App. 3.

“ not read therein, nor may be proved thereby,
 “ is not to be required of any man, that it should
 “ be believed as an article of Faith ?”—will he,
 I say, assent to this on the sole condition “ that
 “ we do not entirely exclude tradition, which
 “ doth not exhibit new articles of Faith, but
 “ confirms and illustrates those which are con-
 “ tained in the sacred writings, and places
 “ about them new guards against gainsayers?”
 if he will, let him reconcile his new tenet with
 what he has himself elsewhere* said, “ *The Ca-*
 “ *tholic Rule of Faith is not merely the written*
 “ *word of God, but the whole word of God, both*
 “ *written and unwritten; in other words Scrip-*
 “ *ture and Tradition, and these propounded and*
 “ *explained by the Catholic Church. This*
 “ *implies that we have a twofold rule or law, and*
 “ *an Interpreter, or Judge, to explain it.*”*

Will he, like Du Pin, admit as to the important points of controversy in the 22d Article, that Purgatory means only that Souls must be purged, that is, purified from all defilement of sin, before they are admitted to everlasting bliss;—that Indulgences are only relaxations or remissions of temporal penalties in this life?†—

* End of Controversy, p. 79.

† The contrary is asserted in “ End of Controversy,” p. 307.

will he abandon altogether the “ worship of the Cross, Relics, Images, nay even of Saints before Images, and pay them only an external respect, and that *not of a religious nature*, which may be laid aside or retained as a matter of indifference?” and if he will do this, will he also undertake to prove, that this can be done without violating the laws of his Church?

Will he reduce the doctrine of transubstantiation to a mere speculative* tenet, and abandon not only the festival, and solemn processions in honour of the sacrament, but also the adoration of it? If he will, let him tell us, how this too is to be reconciled to the doctrine of his Church, especially to the Canon of the Council of Trent.†

Will he, with Du Pin, fly in the face of the Councils of Constance‡ and of Trent,§ and admit no necessity of observing their decrees

* Such seems the result of Du Pin's concession. See App. to Mosheim.

† Sess. xiii. c. 6.

‡ Sess. xiii. “ Hæc consuetudo habenda est pro lege quam non licet reprobare, aut sine Ecclesiæ autoritate pro libito mutare.” Again, “ Quòd nullus presbyter sub pœnâ excommunicationis communicet populum sub utrâque specie panis et vini.” Concil. Labbe, t. xii. p. 100.

§ Sess. xxi. cap. 2.

respecting Communion in one kind? Will he despise the Anathemas* of the latter Council, and communicate with those who deny that entire Christ is taken under one species only?

Will he, following the same leader, admit not only “that in our liturgy there is nothing but what he allows of, save the single rubric relating to the Eucharist, (that it were idolatry to adore the Sacramental Bread and Wine,) but, also, that *in yours there is nothing but what he agrees may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse, or more imperfect for want of it?*” Will he thus strike out at once from your Breviary, your Missal, from every book of public worship belonging to you, those Prayers, and Hymns, and solemn Offices, to the Virgin Mary and the rest of your Saints, which form at present so large a portion of your Devotion, and compels every true Protestant, with Wake, to revolt against the worship of your Church, as being, in those particulars, a compound of folly, blasphemy, and idolatry?

Lastly, and above all, will he deny to the Pope, not only all temporal, but also *all immediate spiritual jurisdiction*, beyond the limits of his own See?†

* Sess. xxi. c. 3.

† App. to Mosheim, No. 8.

Will Dr. Milner, I ask, do all this? If he will, then may he indeed claim a part in Archbishop Wake's admission in favour of Du Pin. But whether he do this, or not, it will still remain for him to show that his Church, as a Church, has given no ground for those accusations which that great Divine has urged against her; and be it remembered by him, that if he fail, the charges of falsehood, misrepresentation, and calumny, with which he has in vain laboured to brand the illustrious name of Wake, will remain indelibly affixed to his own.

But, Sir, I am sorry to say, that Dr. Milner is not the only person of whose unfair and unfounded attacks the Clergy of the Church of England have a right to complain. You yourself, in spite of your general urbanity, and, in spite, too, I am willing to believe, of the real kindness of your nature, have condescended to make charges, which nothing but the most undoubted evidence could justify. On one of them you have already received the animadversions of a learned Bishop of our Church:* to that, therefore, it is unnecessary for me to allude further. But there remains another, which must not pass unnoticed.

* Letter from Bishop of Chester to Charles Butler, Esq.

You say, Sir, that “ the disciples of Hoadley
 “ (and *these unquestionably form a large proportion*
 “ *of the Clergy of the Church of England*) deny
 “ *even the existence of a Sacrament* : all the disci-
 “ ples of that distinguished Prelate *think the*
 “ *word ‘ Sacrament ’ is a word without meaning.*”*

That you believed this assertion, when you wrote it, I am very willing to suppose. But is it possible, that you can, on reflection, persist in believing it? and, if you cannot, what do you yourself now think of the charity, or decency, of thus charging “ a large proportion of “ the Clergy of the Church of England,”—I will not say with prevarication, but—with the direct and palpable violation of their most solemn engagements? Whether Hoadley’s notions on this subject be indeed chargeable with all the impiety you here ascribe to it; still more, whether it be fair to impute to him those consequences which he himself disclaimed,—the present is not a fit occasion to enquire. That he departed from sound doctrine, and violated the engagements he had repeatedly made to his Church, I have no hesitation to admit. It is possible that he may have some living followers among our Clergy: for what

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 319.

Church, or what body of men, has been able to make all its Ministers faithful to their trust? It is also possible, that, if there be any such, they may be known to you. But for myself, I affirm most solemnly, that during the whole of a life, thirty-four years of which have been spent either in an University, or in immediate communication with Clergymen of all orders and degrees, under circumstances, too, which have not peculiarly disqualified me from making observations on the opinions of those with whom I live, I know not that I ever once met with a single Minister of the Church of England, of whom I had reason to believe, that he held the notion ascribed by you to “a large proportion” of our body. Have you had better opportunities of judging? and does experience enable you to pronounce an opposite verdict? That all of your acquaintance among the Clergy of our Church are not infected with this Heresy, I well know; for you number among your friends some of the brightest ornaments of our Episcopal Bench. To one of them,—the most venerable, and on many accounts, among the most distinguished,—you have lately paid* a

* I may be permitted to gratify myself with quoting the following passage from Mr. Butler’s “Reminiscences,” p. 97.—“Of the venerable Bishop of Durham, thus introduced, the Re-

public tribute of your respect, which entitles you to the gratitude of all who love and reverence that time-honoured name.

Such an expression of your own generous feelings, when free from the trammels of secta-

“ miniscent begs leave to add,—that having been profession-
 “ ally employed and confidentially consulted by his Lordship
 “ during half a century, he has come to the knowledge of a
 “ multitude of instances of his Lordship’s exemplary charity
 “ and well-regulated munificence; and that £100,000 would
 “ not make up the amount of those, in the foundation or ar-
 “ rangement of which, his Lordship has professionally employed
 “ the Reminiscent: he is also aware that many of his Lord-
 “ ship’s other acts of liberality are unknown to him except by
 “ general report.” Let me follow this extract with the well-
 known passage of Burke, on which it is so felicitous a comment.
 “ The people of England can see, without pain or grudging,
 “ a Bishop of Durham, or a Bishop of Winchester, in possession
 “ of ten thousand pounds a year; and cannot conceive why it
 “ is in worse hands, than estates to the like amount in the
 “ hands of this Earl, or that Squire, although it may be true
 “ that so many dogs and horses are not kept by the former,
 “ and fed with the victuals which ought to nourish the children
 “ of the people. It is true the whole Church revenue is not
 “ always employed, and to every shilling, in charity; nor per-
 “ haps ought it; but something is generally so employed. It
 “ is better to cherish virtue and humanity, by leaving much to
 “ free will, than to attempt to make men mere machines and
 “ instruments of a political benevolence. The world, on the
 “ whole, will gain by a liberty, without which virtue cannot
 “ subsist.”

rian prejudice, heightens the surprise with which I have read that unfortunate sentence which you suffered in an evil hour to fall from your pen. Leave, Sir, these calumnies to others—leave them to men, who do not feel themselves disgraced by using them. Let Dr. Milner, if he will, draw the picture of an imaginary divine of the Church of England, and assure the world, that he is, “like most of his learned and dignified brethren, in these times, of that free and, as it is called, liberal turn of mind, as to *explain away the mysteries, and a great many of the articles*” of his Religion, which *were wont to be considered as essential to it.*”^{*} Shall I recriminate? Shall I contrast this baseless charge against the Clergy of the Church of England, with the proved and convicted insincerity of their accuser? No! Sir—I disdain so poor a triumph. I have cited this passage of your reverend Friend’s, only to remind you, that you may safely leave the defamatory parts of your case in his hands: from you we have a right to look for justice, and for candour.

The truth is, (and for testimony to it I appeal to all men of all sects and parties, who have any opportunity of observing,) that, whatever

^{*} End of Controversy, p. 22.

faults may be ascribed to the present Clergy of the Church of England, indifference to the tenets of that Church forms no part of their character. There is, on the contrary, an increased and increasing spirit of earnestness in investigating, and of zeal in preaching them: nor could an adversary, at any period since the Reformation, with less shadow of justice, than at present, have arraigned the Established Clergy for unfaithfulness to the articles of their religion. Nay, even in Hoadley's own time, so little were his notions countenanced by the Clergy, that the Lower House of Convocation passed a strong vote against him; nor could any thing have shielded him from the further consequences of their indignation, had not the injustice or the timidity of government prevented that body from ever deliberating again.

LETTER XIV.

The Power of the Pope.

WE are now come to that article of your Church's doctrine, in which, if we are to take the facts, as you, and Dr. Doyle, and other of your writers represent them, the triumph of reason and common sense over the most inveterate and sacred prejudices has been most conspicuous. The monstrous claims of the Pope to a pre-eminence, not of rank merely, but of authority and jurisdiction over the greatest Princes of the earth,—his right to depose them for heresy and favouring heresy,—his consequent right to absolve subjects from their allegiance,—are now, it seems, disclaimed by all who live beyond the boundaries of Italy. There, indeed, they appear to be still clung to, with fond, however unavailing, regret: and the most that could be obtained in the rescript of the Pope, in 1793, was, a declaration that the See of Rome *never taught* that faith is not to be kept with the heterodox; that an Oath to Kings separated from Catholic Communion can

be violated ; or that it is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions.* Accordingly, it is worthy of remark, that when the judgment of foreign Universities, on these and similar points, was sought at the instance of Mr. Pitt, no attempt seems to have been made to obtain from any Italian quarter the disclaimer required. But to the responses of the oracle at Alcala or Douay, or elsewhere, little regard can be due, till it is shewn, that a right to decide on articles of Faith was ever allowed to them by any legitimate or acknowledged authority. I should rather insist, that the very necessity of having recourse to such and so various quarters, instead of going at once to Rome, proves most satisfactorily, that from Rome you could not obtain what was thought and felt to be necessary : that this was, in short, on the very face of it, a mere counterpart of the expedient of Henry the Eighth,—adopted for the very same reasons and not entitled to so much respect ; for his authorities were more numerous, in a degree which I will not stop to calculate. Yet his right to act on the judgment of Universities is treated by your writers with scorn : why is

* Speech of Sir J. C. Hippesley, p. 4.

your appeal to a part only of the same authorities entitled to more respect?

From these unaccredited documents let us look to the authority to which you yourself refer. It is contained in the Canon of the tenth Session of the Council of Florence, which, according to you, defined, that "full power" was delegated to the Bishop of Rome in the "person of St. Peter, to feed, *regulate*, and "govern the Universal Church, as expressed "in the general Councils and holy Canons." "THIS," you say, "IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE "ROMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE, and beyond it no Roman-Catholic is required to believe."*

Now, here, Sir, I have once more (and, I rejoice to say, for the last time) to remonstrate with you on the extreme laxity of the principle which regulates your conduct on these occasions. You know, as well as I can tell you, that this is very far from being a full or adequate representation of the Decree to which you refer; that much remains behind, which you felt it inconvenient to bring forward, and which you probably hoped, no adversary would

* Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, p. 119.

take the trouble of adducing against you. The real decree of the Council is as follows :

“ Moreover, we define, that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have a primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and true VICAR (or Representative, *Τοπῶντος*) OF CHRIST, and that he is HEAD OF THE WHOLE CHURCH, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians ; and that to him in St. Peter was delegated by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, *rule* (*regere*), and govern the universal Church ; as also is contained in the acts of general Councils and in the holy Canons.”*

Is there no difference between these two statements ? Is it nothing, that the Church has declared the Pope to be the *Representative* of our Lord Jesus, and, *as such*, (not in the sense of dignity and honour merely,) is the *Head of the whole Church*, the very name which our Lord assumed for himself ? Is it nothing that these high titles accompany and explain the commission alleged to be given to him, of feeding, ruling, and governing the Church with

* Coneil. Labbè, t. xiii. p. 516.

full power? Is it fair dealing to suppress particulars such as these? Does it accord with the dignity of your own honourable feelings, to expose yourself to be thus tracked and hunted through every citation you make, and to be indebted, at last, to the forbearance of an opponent for not exhibiting all your obliquities in a harsher tone, than that of remonstrance?

But for a clearer view of the doctrine of your Church, I will look beyond the decree itself to the other authorities to which it refers us. Of general Councils, we find the Council of Constance pronouncing an Anathema against the denial of the Pope's being immediate Vicar of Christ and the Apostles.*

The fourth, or great Laterane Council, declares “ that the secular powers shall be admonished, and, if necessary, be compelled by ecclesiastical censures, to *make oath* that they will, to the utmost of their power, *strive to exterminate* from their territory *all Heretics*, declared to be such by the Church, and further, that if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his territory from all taint of heresy, he

* Sess. 8.

“ shall be excommunicated by the Metropoli-
 “ tans and other provincial Bishops ; and if
 “ he contemptuously omit to give satisfaction
 “ within a year, it shall be signified to *the Holy*
 “ *Pontiff, in order that he may thenceforth pro-*
 “ *claim his vassals absolved from fealty to him, and*
 “ *may expose to Catholics his territory to be oc-*
 “ *cupied by them, who, having exterminated the*
 “ *Heretics, may possess the same without contradic-*
 “ *tion.*”*

Thus did this “ great Council,” by far the most numerous that ever assembled, atchieve the proudest victory over the common feelings of humanity, after having already, by its decree in favour of transubstantiation, triumphed with no less glory over the senses and understanding of mankind.

It must not be omitted that the Roman Church is declared by this same Council to be, “ by the dispensation of the Lord, the *mother*
 “ *and mistress of all Churches,*” a title which must of course be interpreted by its context in the Acts of this Council. This same title is given to the Church of Rome by the Synod of

* Con. Lab. t. xi. p. 147. We have already seen the reward given by this Council to those who assume the Cross for the extermination of Heretics. See above, p. 183.

Trent repeatedly,* and also by the Creed of Pius IV. In the Catechism of Trent, carrying with it, as you will admit, the authority of that Council, it is said,† that “Christ placed a man
“over his Church to be the vicegerent and the
“administrator of his power, and commended
“his sheep to Peter to be fed by him in the
“amplest terms, in order that the Successor of
“Peter might have completely the same power
“of ruling and governing the whole Church.”

I will not look for more authorities from Councils, but will go to one or two of the “holy Canons,” to which the Decree of the Council of Florence has directed us. In executing this part of my undertaking, I shall strictly confine myself to the Canons themselves; I will not have recourse to the Glosses on them, tempting as that store of impiety and extravagance must be confessed to be, and in spite of the example of Dr. Doyle, whom we have already seen seeking in a misapplied gloss of a Canon of Boniface VIII. a palliative for one of the distressing tenets of his Church.

The first shall be taken from an Extrav. of

* Sess. vii. can. 3. Sess. xvi. cap. 3. Sess. xxii. cap. 8. Sess. xxv. De del. cib.

† Cat. Rom. pars 2, suæ potestatis Vicarium et Ministrum.

(Dr. Doyle's authority) Boniface VIII., the lemma of which is as follows: "All the faithful
 " of Christ are of necessity of salvation under
 " the Roman Pontiff; who has both swords, and
 " judges all men, but is judged by none."
 " We are instructed by the Gospel that in
 " this power of his there are two swords, the
 " spiritual and the temporal." "Certainly, he
 " who denies the temporal sword to be in the
 " power of the Pope, ill understands the word
 " of the Lord, 'Put up thy sword into its
 " 'sheath.' *Both swords, therefore, the spiritual*
 " *and the material, are in the power of the Church**
 " —the one to be used for the Church, the other
 " by it—the one by the Priest, the other by
 " the hand of Kings and Soldiers, but *at the*
 " *nod and sufferance of the Priest.* But one
 " sword ought to be under the other, and the
 " *temporal authority to be subjected to the spi-*
 " *ritual,*" &c. "For, according to the word of
 " truth, the spiritual power has to appoint and
 " judge the earthly, if it be not good."—
 " Therefore, if the earthly power err, it shall
 " be judged by the spiritual power:" "Finally,
 " we declare, say, define, and pronounce, that

* This is quoted and made a ground of argument by Bellarmine, "De Mem. Ecc. Mil. lib. iii. c. 22."

“ *it is of necessity of salvation to every creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.*”*

My next shall be from an epistle of Innocent III. to the Eastern Emperor of his day, (inserted among the Canons, and cited by Bellarmine,)†
 “ You ought to have known the prerogative of the Priesthood from its being said by God, not to a King but to a Priest,† not to one descended from royal but from priestly parentage, ‘ See! I have set thee up over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root up and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down; to build and to plant.’ ”‡

“ Besides, you ought to know that God made two lights in the firmament of Heaven, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night—both great, but one the greater. In the firmament of Heaven, therefore, that is, of the universal Church, God made two great lights—that is, instituted two dignities, which are the authority of the Pope and the power of Kings. But that which rules over the days, that is, spi-

* De Maj. et Obed. Unam Sanctam. Ext. Com.

† Bell. de Pont. Rom. l. ii. c. 14.

‡ Jer. i. 10. This was especially cited by Pius V. in his Bull against Elizabeth. It is also cited by Clement XIV. in his Bull, Dominus ac Redemptor noster, dated 21st July, 1773.

“ rituals, is the greater : and that which rules
 “ over carnals, is the lesser. So that the differ-
 “ ence between Pontiffs and Kings may be un-
 “ derstood to be as great as between the Sun
 “ and the Moon.”*

In order to estimate the full value of this authority,† we must remember, that it came from that very Innocent III. who presided over the great Council of Laterane ; we may, therefore, now the better understand in what sense, and to what extent, that Council pronounces the Roman Church to be “ the Mother and
 “ *Mistress* of all Churches.”

Need I add, that the same Innocent, in another Canon,‡ speaks of the Roman Pontiff as of not a mere man, but as of one who bears *the part of the true God on earth*?

I will only refer to one more Canon, the lemma of which is, “ That the Pope alone
 “ frees from a lawful oath.” The case is that of Gelasius writing to the Emperor Anastasius, and threatening to depose him on account of his wickedness, after the example of Zachary, who deposed the King of the Franks, not so

* Decret. Greg. l. i. De Maj. et Obed. Solitæ.

† Bell. de Pont. Rom. l. ii. c. 14.

‡ De Translat. Episcopi—non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terrâ.

much on account of his sins, as because he was useless.*

For this assertion of the divine right of the Roman Pontiff was not a mere idle dictum. On the contrary, it occasionally assumed a port sufficiently energetic and formidable. This is not an occasion which demands an enumeration of every instance to be found in history. But, as Dr. Doyle tells the Committee of the House of Commons, that, “as far as he is acquainted
“with the history of the claims of the Popes to
“temporal interference, *they rested them upon*
“*some temporal right previously acquired by them-*
“*selves or their predecessors,*† with the single
“exception of Boniface VIII.,” I may be permitted to ask, what temporal right had been acquired by Gregory III. over the Eastern Empire, entitling him to forbid taxes to be paid to Leo the Iconoclast, who had been excommunicated by him?‡ Again, who had given Zachary, or any of his predecessors, any temporal right over the kingdom of France, by virtue of which he actually deposed Childeric, (as we have just seen,) on account of his being indo-

* Dis. xv. q. 6. c. alius.

† Second Report on State of Ireland, p. 191.

‡ See Bell. De Rom. Pont. lib. v. c. 8.

lent and useless, and substituted Pepin in his place?

Dr. Doyle seems to have taken this notion in part from the claims of the Popes over the Western Empire, by virtue of which they deposed several who sate on the Imperial Throne. But this very claim was acquired by an act of mere Papal power. For Leo III. transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, because the Greeks could not support the falling Western Church: from this epoch is dated the claims of the Popes to confirm the election of the Emperors, and to receive the oath of fidelity from him, “And with very good reason,” says Bellarmine, “for he who had it in his power to confer the empire, had it also in his power to impose conditions, lest there should be a schismatic or heretic Emperor.”*

It will hardly be necessary to multiply instances, or to refer to facts which are notorious in the history of our own country, and which are likely to be more particularly discussed between you and Mr. Southey. I will rather enquire, what has been the construction put on the decrees of Councils, and the holy Canons, to which we are referred by your own authority,

* Ibid.

the decree of the Council of Florence—what, in short, is the statement of the doctrine of your Church on this important point, given by your “great controvertist,” Bellarmine. By choosing him for our guide, we are pretty sure of not been taken too far: for his notions, as I have already said, were disrelished at Rome, because he did not carry the Papal prerogative far enough.

Of the spiritual power communicated to the Pope in Saint Peter, particularly of his infallibility, or, to use the modern phrase, his inerrancy, Bellarmine's doctrine amounts to this; “that the Pope cannot err, when teaching the whole Church in a matter of faith, or delivering precepts of morals, which are prescribed to the whole Church, and which relate to matters necessary to Salvation, or good or evil in themselves. He is the judge of controversies, and his judgment is certain and infallible. Hence, it is a point universally admitted in the Catholic Church, that, as Bishops in their own Dioceses, so the Pope, throughout the whole Church, can make laws, which bind the Conscience.”*

This doctrine of Bellarmine does not quite

* Bell. De Rom. Pont. l. iv. c. 3. 5. 15.

accord with that which is taught at Maynooth, where it is held to be “not hæretical or schismatical,” to deny the inerrancy of the Pope, even when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*. But he is admitted to be the centre of Catholic Communion, so that, all, who do not hold communion with him, are cut off from the Catholic Church: it is also admitted, that he has the right of making decrees of Faith, and of general discipline; that all greater matters of both ought to be referred to him;* and that a dogmatic definition of his directed to all the Churches, and sufficiently promulged, is really approved by the Bishops by the very fact of their not reclaiming against it and becomes an irreversible judgment of the Church.

Concerning the Pope's temporal power, Bellarmine tells us, “there are three opinions; first, “that the Pope, by divine right, has an unlimited “power (*plenissimam potestatem*) over the whole “world in political as well as ecclesiastical matters:—(from this opinion he simply dissents, “without blaming it; and this dissent of his was “the principal cause of his disgrace at Rome:) “—a second opinion (which, he calls, a *heresy*, “rather than an opinion,) is in the opposite ex-

* *Tractat. De Ecclesiâ*, 363. 368. 372. 376. 152.

“treme, that the Pope has not, by divine right,
“any temporal power, nor can in any way
“command secular Princes, much less depose
“them, even though they may deserve to be
“otherwise deposed:—nay, that it is contrary
“to the law of God that the spiritual and
“temporal swords be both committed to the
“same hand.” “The third opinion lies be-
“tween the two former, and *is commonly*
“*held by Catholic divines*; namely, that the
“Pope, as Pope, has not directly and immedi-
“ately any temporal, but only a spiritual
“power; nevertheless, that *by reason of the*
“*spiritual, he has, at least indirectly, a certain*
“*power, and that supreme, in temporals.*” This
is the opinion of Bellarmine himself, who says,
in conformity to it, that, “the power of the
“Pope is indeed properly in itself, and directly,
“spiritual; but that by it he can dispose of the
“temporal things of all Christians, when that
“is required for the end of the spiritual power,
“to which the ends of all temporal powers are
“subordinate:” for though “he has no merely
“temporal power, yet he has in ordine ad
“bonum spirituale the highest power over
“temporals.” This he illustrated by the fol-
lowing similitude, adopted by many great
writers:—

“ Those two powers in the Church are like
“ the spirit and the flesh in the natural man: for
“ spirit and flesh are, as it were, two bodies po-
“ litic, which may be found both separate and
“ conjoined. The flesh has sense and appetite,
“ to which there are correspondent acts and
“ objects proportioned, and the end of all these
“ is the health and good constitution of the
“ body. The spirit has intellect and will, pro-
“ portioned acts and objects, and for its end
“ the sanctity and perfection of the soul. The
“ flesh is without the spirit in brutes, the spirit
“ without the flesh in angels, and the two are
“ united in man. The flesh is the inferior, the
“ spirit the superior; and though the spirit
“ does not mix itself in the acts of the flesh,
“ but permits it, as in brutes, to exert its own
“ acts, nevertheless, when these are opposed to
“ the end of the spirit itself, the spirit commands
“ the flesh, and chastises it, and imposes afflic-
“ tions on it, even with some damage to the
“ body itself, and compels the tongue not to
“ speak, the eyes not to see, &c. So also, if
“ any operation of the flesh, or even death
“ itself, be requisite to obtain the end of the
“ spirit, the spirit can command the flesh to
“ expose itself and all that belongs to it, as we
“ see in the case of martyrs.”

“ Now *exactly after this manner* (ita prorsùs)
“ the political power has its Prince, laws, judi-
“ catures, &c. and the ecclesiastical its Bishops,
“ canons, judicatures, &c. The one has tem-
“ poral peace, the other eternal peace, for its
“ end. Sometimes they are separate, (as in
“ the days of the apostles,) sometimes they are
“ united, as at present. When united, they
“ make one body, and therefore ought to be
“ connected; the inferior being subjected and
“ subordinate to the superior. Therefore the
“ spiritual power does not mix itself in tem-
“ poral concerns, but suffers all things to pro-
“ ceed, as before the union, so long as they do
“ not oppose the spiritual end, or be not neces-
“ sary to obtain it. But *if any thing of this*
“ *sort occurs, the spiritual can, and ought to*
“ *coerce the temporal* by any way and means
“ which shall seem necessary for its purpose.”

He next applies this both to secular persons and to secular things. “ The Pope, as Pope,
“ cannot ordinarily depose temporal Princes,
“ even for a just cause, in the manner in which
“ he deposes Bishops, that is, as their ordinary
“ Judge: *he may, however, change kingdoms;*
“ take away from one and give to another, as
“ supreme spiritual chief, *if it be necessary for*
“ *the salvation of souls.*”

“ As to laws, the Pope, as Pope, cannot
“ ordinarily make a civil law, or confirm or
“ abrogate the laws of princes, because he is
“ not himself political Prince of the Church:
“ nevertheless he may do all these things, if
“ any civil law be necessary to the salvation
“ of souls, and kings will not enact it, or if any
“ other be hurtful to souls, and yet kings will
“ not abrogate it.”

“ *Therefore the best general rule is, that when*
“ *on the same point the laws of the state and those*
“ *of the Pope are found to be contrary, if the mat-*
“ *ter of the law concern the danger of souls, the*
“ *law of the state is abrogated by that of the Pope:*
“ *But when the matter of the law is a temporal*
“ *thing, not concerning the danger of souls, the law*
“ *of the Pope cannot abrogate the law of the state;*
“ *but both are to be kept, the one in foro ecclesias-*
“ *tico, the other in foro civili.*”

He next proceeds to establish his doctrine by reasons. I shall content myself with quoting two; first, that “ it is not lawful for Christians
“ to tolerate an infidel or heretical king, if he
“ endeavour to pervert his subjects to heresy
“ or infidelity; but *the decision of the question*
“ *whether a king is perverting to heresy or not,*
“ *belongs to the Pope, to whom is entrusted the care*
“ *of religion:—therefore it is the Pope's part to*

“decide, whether the king ought to be deposed or not.” The second reason is, “when kings and princes come to the Church, to be made Christians, they are received with an express or tacit compact, that they submit their sceptres to Christ, and that they promise to keep the faith of Christ, even under the penalty of losing their kingdom: therefore when they become heretics, or oppose religion, they may be judged by the Church, and even deposed.”

Before I conclude this statement of the doctrine of Bellarmine, it is proper to say, that in his “*Recognitio Librorum*,” his corrections of this work are all in the way of making them more favourable to the Pope; and he says that he is become more cautious, because great discussions on these matters had taken place since he wrote it. One of his corrections I subjoin. “He does not now approve what he had said on the subject of not deposing infidel princes, unless they strive to turn their people from the faith: that he now holds that such princes may be deposed, even if they do not make such attempts. And yet,” he adds, “the Church does not always exercise this right, *either because it has not sufficient strength, or does not think it expedient.*”

Such, Sir, is the conclusion drawn from the

premises which you yourself are obliged to acknowledge, by the ablest and acutest reasoner your Church has boasted in modern times. Less than his doctrine cannot, I think, be drawn from the same premises by any just process of argument; though I am aware that much less is, in fact, laid down in the Class-book of Maynooth. But whether Bellarmine, or Delahogue, be the better reasoner, I leave to any sufficient and impartial judge to decide.

There remain one or two other points connected with the power of the Pope and of the See of Rome, which must not be omitted, (though I shall not treat them at large) particularly respecting heretics.

Of the right of any Church to cut off from its communion all whom it considers heretical, no question can be moved. Therefore if excommunication were all the penalty which the Church of Rome had claimed a right to inflict, there could be no fair ground of complaint against her; even though the civil power, acting on the judgment of the Church, should, of its own motion, inflict on those whom the Church had excommunicated, any measure of punishment whatever. But this you will hardly deny, is very far indeed from being the case. We have already seen, in part, what has been

decreed against heretics by the Great Lateran Council; but it is necessary that I should here add, that we have not seen all; that the same Council decrees that “those whom the Church
 “condemns as heretics are to be delivered over
 “to the secular power, to be punished in the
 “manner that is due.” What that manner is, I need hardly remind my readers. It was death—death in its most appalling form, death by burning. This accursed sentence was the invention of the Church of Rome; its Canons recognize it, those Canons to which Councils refer, and the creed of Pius IV. has recognized;—“I also profess and without any hesitation* receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Holy Canons, and general Councils,” &c. So indisputable is this, that the first statute in our own country for the burning of heretics expressly states, that this is to be done on all, who are left, *according to the Holy Canons*, to the secular Court; and sheriffs, &c. are ordered to attend in person and execute it, “*when required thereto by the said Diocesan or his commissaries.*”†—Nay “even those who are under *suspicion only*, if they cannot clear themselves, are to be struck

* Indubitanter—Mr. Butler translates it *undoubtedly*.

† 2 H. 4. c. 15.

“ with the sword of anathema ;” and are to be avoided by all, till they have given satisfaction ; but if they continue excommunicated for a year, they are to be condemned as heretics. “ Those
 “ who receive, defend, or favour heretics, are
 “ to be excommunicated, and if they do not
 “ give satisfaction within a year, they become
 “ *ipso jure infamous, inadmissible to any public*
 “ *offices, or councils, not allowed to vote at any*
 “ *elections, nor to give evidence, nor to make a will,*
 “ *nor take an inheritance.*” There are other disabilities added, which I will not take the trouble of transcribing.

Now this, be it remembered, is the decree of the great Lateran Council, one of pre-eminent authority, cited as such with particular honour by the Council of Trent. It is the voice, therefore, if any thing can be, of your Church itself.

From this great Council, I will jump at once to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in order that my readers may see that the spirit of your Church (whatever happens to individuals) remains, and must ever remain, while that Church itself remains, unchanged and unchangeable. The Catechism tells us, that “ Heretics
 “ and Schismatics do not belong to the Church,
 “ any more than vagabonds or renegadoes be-
 “ long to an army from which they ran away.

“ Yet it is not to be denied, but that they are in the power of the Church, as those who may be judged by her, and condemned with an anathema.”*

I hardly need remind you, that this Catechism is an authority to which not only you, but Dr. Doyle, and every one else among you, constantly refer.

I argue not on these matters; I leave them to others to make them the grounds of argument: my humble province is merely to point them out.

But here a point arises, on which I must, I fear, argue a little, though it shall be a very little. “ That an oath made to heretics is not binding,” under certain circumstances, is a position which has been sometimes laid to the charge of your Church. Dr. Doyle, indeed, in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords, treats the very suggestion of it as hardly fit to be noticed, and quite unworthy of denial: it is “ too blasphemous to be contemplated.”†

Now, Sir, however Dr. Doyle may think fit to regard such a notion, it is quite capable of proof that it has been maintained by eminent

* I quote from the Irish edition, Dublin, 1816, “ faithfully translated into English by permission.”—p. 70.

† P. 387.

writers of your Church. Not only so, but there is some evidence—whether sufficient or not,—(I do not think it sufficient)—but there is some evidence, that your Church itself has inculcated this maxim, if not in direct terms, at least by its actions. I will state this evidence briefly, but I trust fairly. “ John Hus, a Bohemian reformer, “ went to the Council of Constance, under a “ safe-conduct granted to him by his sovereign, “ the Emperor Sigismund, within whose domi- “ nions the Council was held. Having been con- “ victed of heresy, he was delivered over to the “ civil power; and the same Emperor Sigismund, “ in spite of his own urgent suit to the contrary, “ was required and persuaded to punish him “ with death.” The Council, in its solemn and authentic decree,* declared that “ from no safe- “ conduct, granted by the Emperor, Kings, and “ other Princes, to heretics, or persons suspected “ of heresy thinking by these means to reclaim “ them from their errors, *by whatever obligation “ they may have bound themselves*, can any preju- “ dice be raised against the Catholic Faith or “ Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, nor any impedi- “ ment accrue to prevent a competent and “ ecclesiastical Judge from enquiring into the

* Sess. xix.

“ errors of the said persons, and to proceed
“ against them in due form, and to punish them
“ to the full extent of justice, even though they
“ come to the place in reliance on the safe-con-
“ duct, and otherwise would not have come;
“ and it further declares, that he who granted
“ the safe-conduct, after having done what lay
“ in him, is free from all obligation in permitting
“ this course to be followed.”

In a former part of the proceedings of this same session we find what follows:—“ Whereas
“ some persons, of evil intention, or wishing to
“ be wise above that which is permitted, are
“ speaking injurious things, *not merely against*
“ *the Royal Majesty, but even, as is reported,*
“ *against the Sacred Council,* affirming or insinu-
“ ating, publicly and privately, that the safe-
“ conduct formerly granted by the invincible
“ Prince, the Emperor Sigismund, to John Hus,
“ of damned memory, was unduly violated con-
“ trary to justice and honesty, although the
“ said John Hus, by pertinaciously resisting
“ the Catholic Faith, had deprived himself of
“ all right to any benefit of safe-conduct or
“ privilege, and no faith given to him, by the
“ law of nature, of God, or of man, was to be
“ observed to him in prejudice of the Catholic
“ Faith;—therefore the Holy Synod, by the

“ tenor of these presents, declares that the said
“ invincible Prince, in the matter of the said
“ late John Hus, notwithstanding the aforesaid
“ safe-conduct, was* bound by right to do what
“ he did, and in so doing did what was lawful,
“ and what became the Royal Majesty.”

Now, Sir, I entirely assent to the decision of the Council, and I ground my assent on those principles of your Church, which we have already seen. The cognisance of heresy was in the ecclesiastical power, which is the superior; and the Emperor, (though Hus's sovereign Prince,) as a faithful Son of the Church, had no right to grant a safe-conduct to him, nor could his unlawful presumption in thus doing what he was not authorized, though a Sovereign, to do, interfere with the higher power of the Church, nor even make it lawful for him to refuse to discharge his duty in executing the commands of the Council, and letting the law take its course, by burning the heretic, Hus. As for the oath, it was plainly an unlawful oath, or lawful only so far as it implied no violation of what was his bounden duty before he took it:—the sin, in short, would have been in keeping it, so far as it was contrary to a previous obligation.

* *Ex juris debito fecisse quod licuit, &c.*

All this is, I think, quite plain; but it is so only on the supposition that the case between the ecclesiastical and temporal powers be what has been stated. On any other supposition it is impossible to acquit the general Council of Constance, and of course the Church of Rome, of maintaining in its solemn decree, that an oath is not to be kept with heretics when it interferes, I will not say with the rights, (for the right, on the present supposition, is excluded,) but with the convenience or wishes of the Church. Choose, Sir, which part of the alternative you please; but do not suppose that you shall be suffered to escape with all the non-chalance you once exhibited on this subject. “*What does it signify? If the Council of Constance authorised the violation of the safe-conduct, it did infamously, and there’s an end on’t.*”*

Before I quit this matter, I wish to give the Council the full benefit of their own prudence, as displayed in the case of Jerome of Prague. He came under a safe-conduct granted by the Council itself; was tried, condemned as a heretic, handed over to the civil power, and

* Address to the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland,—p. 11. Mr. Butler, on that occasion, affected to doubt the facts of the case. To prevent all quibbles of this kind, I refer him to the authorities cited in the Supplemental Letter.

burned. But in this safe-conduct there was an express saving of the point of justice—*salvâ justitiâ* was inserted: of course, therefore, Jerome had nothing to complain of—he came at his peril.

There is a third case on record, but as I have not time to find any other than heretical authority, I claim no attention for it from any one who declines believing it. It is the case of Paul V., who is said to have adopted a more ingenious and hardly less satisfactory course, than the Council of Constance followed in Jerome's instance. Father Fulgentio, the friend of the illustrious Paul Sarpi, was prevailed with to come to Rome under a safe-conduct granted by the Pope. When there, he was treated as a heretic, and on appealing to his safe-conduct, was answered, that "*the conduct was safe for his coming thither, but not for his going thence.*" After this, who will deny the strict fidelity of the Church of Rome to all its engagements with heretics? Among these engagements, it has always reckoned as the most sacred, that of labouring for the spiritual good of its rebellious children, "the deserters from its camp," as the Catechism of Trent calls them, by a little gentle corporal correction.

But these are matters quite gone by:—"last

“ year’s Almanac,” I think they were called in our enlightened House of Commons. Dr. Doyle, the modern oracle not of Roman-Catholics only, but of a very large number of British senators, and of at least one great British statesman, has pronounced, that the deposing power, in particular, is “ perfectly obsolete,” “ completely extinct.”* I really do not wish to dwell on verbal criticism ; but I must suggest that these expressions admit that the power (which evidently is here put for a *claim of right*) did once exist : at any rate, though Dr. Doyle and his brethren in Ireland do not teach it, he will admit that it has been in former times generally taught by your divines, and acted upon, enforced, but never disclaimed at Rome. No longer ago than the year 1789 a *Protestation against the doctrine of the Pope’s infallibility*, in matters of faith—and against the following tenets—that *Princes excommunicated by the Pope may be deposed by their subjects*—that *the Pope can absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance*—and that *the Pope hath a civil jurisdiction within the realms of other Princes*—having been signed by almost every Roman-Catholic of consideration in England, (it has your very respectable signature among

* Report of Lords’ Committee, p. 386.

the rest,) *was condemned by some of the Apostolic Vicars*, and the signatures of the greater number in consequence withdrawn. An interesting correspondence took place on this occasion between the Committee of the Roman-Catholics and the Apostolic Vicars, from one letter of which, addressed to John, Bishop of Centuria, Vicar Apostolic of the Southern See in England, and signed

CHAS. BERINGTON,	STOURTON,
JOS. WILKS,	PETRE,
	HENRY CH. ENGLEFIELD,
	JOHN THROCKMORTON,
	JOHN TOWNLEY,
	THOMAS HORNGOLD,

I beg leave to make the following extract :—

“ Here, my Lord, let us pause. The Pro-
 “ testation was sanctioned by all the Apostolic
 “ Vicars; the Oath was the work of Govern-
 “ ment.” “ In the following October the
 “ Vicars Apostolic published the first encyclical
 “ letter. Without assigning one reason, with-
 “ out even pointing out one exceptionable pas-
 “ sage, *the Oath was, by that letter, declared to be*
 “ *unlawful*, and our submission to the mandate
 “ was required. Thus this Oath, which, upon
 “ the requisition of Government, and with the
 “ most explicit sanction of our Bishop, we had

“ signified to be admissible, *an Oath which in its*
 “ *effects and tendency is a mere profession of tem-*
 “ *poral allegiance, and repetition of that Pro-*
 “ *testation, which all the Vicars, with their coad-*
 “ *jutors and clergy, had signed but a few months*
 “ *before; that very Oath, my Lord, was pronounced*
 “ *altogether unlawful; and the Vicar Apostolic of*
 “ *the Western District, by his printed letter of*
 “ *the 24th of December, 1789, accuses us of an*
 “ *attempt to injure religion; and the Vicar Apos-*
 “ *tolic of the Nothern District, in his pastoral*
 “ *letter, talked of our infernal stratagems.*”*

Now, Sir, I do not say that all these matters do not admit of explanation; they may, for aught I know, be accounted for in the most satisfactory manner. But I do say, that they are not to be got rid of in the very free and easy style which you and Dr. Doyle think proper to adopt.

Neither is this all, which to plain understandings seems a little at variance with the Doctor's representation. In the year 1800, the late Pope Pius VII. addressed his late most Christian Majesty, the eldest son of the Church, Louis XVIII., as lawful King of France, and successor of St. Louis, and made to him, *as*

* I quote from “Declaration and Protestation of the Roman-Catholics of England,” &c. London. Printed for Stockdale. 1812. Page 95.

such, the usual communication of the intelligence of his election to the Popedom. In the following year, on April 10th, 1801, the same Pope entered into a Concordat with Buonaparte, which instrument, besides suppressing 146 episcopal and metropolitan sees, and dismissing their bishops and metropolitans without any form of judicature, absolves all Frenchmen from their oaths of allegiance to their legitimate sovereign Louis XVIII., and authorizes an oath of allegiance to the First Consul. The Pope's words are, "Consensimus, ut episcopi, antequam episcopale munus suscipiant, coram Primo Consule juramentum fidelitatis emittant," "consensimus ut parochi," &c.

In reference to this affair, a book was printed in London in the year 1807, with the name of a most respectable gentleman of your Church in the title-page, from which you will permit me to present my readers with the following most instructive passage:—"The ecclesiastical division of France by the Pope and Buonaparte has not been acquiesced in by some of the Gallican Prelates: they appear *much perplexed* between allegiance to the Bourbons, and duty to the Pope. They invoke the Canons," and "their appeal to the Canons must be decided in their favour, if the case should be tried by

“ the ordinary rules of the ecclesiastical polity
 “ of the Roman-Catholic Church. But, at the
 “ time we speak of, no sentence, founded on
 “ those rules, could be carried into execution.
 “ Such was the *extraordinary* state of things,
 “ that nothing short of the DOMINIUM ALTUM,
 “ or the *right of providing for extraordinary cases*
 “ *by extraordinary acts of authority*, could be ex-
 “ erted with effect: and that DOMINIUM ALTUM
 “ *the venerable prelates cannot, consistently with*
 “ *their own principles, deny to the successors of St.*
 “ *Peter*”!

I have called this a most instructive passage, and some of my readers will probably agree with me in so considering it. It tells us of a new security for our existing institutions in Church and State, (as far as the Pope can endanger them,) if the proposed bills should pass—it is this, that no harm shall be done to them, no exertion of the DOMINIUM ALTUM, *if—no extraordinary case shall arise, which may require to be provided for by an extraordinary act of authority.*

Having thus stated the obligation we owe to this writer, I will no longer withhold his name from the grateful commemoration of my fellow Protestants. It is “CHARLES BUTLER, OF LIN-

COLN'S INN, ESQUIRE,"* who, with becoming modesty, wishes at present to be chiefly known as author of the Book of the Roman-Catholic Church—a book, at which I am now going to take (I rejoice to say) one parting glance.

In the last page of the chapter to which I have chiefly addressed myself, I meet with the following passage “on Papal Authority”:†—
 “Permit me to request you will say if you conscientiously believe, that there is now a single Catholic who can justly be charged with the monstrous and blasphemous doctrines, with which you attempt in this part of your work to brand us. *Think of the Gallican Declaration of 1682, which, so far as respects the independence of the secular on the spiritual power, in temporal concerns, is recognized by the whole Roman-Catholic world.*”

You have made very honourable mention of the Rev. C. Plowden, President, I believe, of the College at Stonyhurst, and Provincial of the Jesuits, lately deceased. This

* Butler's Works, vol. ii. p. 13. Proofs and Illustrations. Revolutions of the Germanic empire. London. 1807. I readily admit that there are in the same work several strong passages against the Pope's temporal power.

† Book, &c. p. 133.

learned writer, in a work entitled “Considerations on the Modern Opinion of the Infallibility of the Holy See in the Decision of Dogmatical Questions,” says as follows:—

“Before the Declaration of the Gallican Church, in 1682, it was the general persuasion of the Roman-Catholics, that the solemn decisions of the Holy See, in matters of Dogmatical and moral importance, are infallible.”—P. 1st,

No body is ignorant that the Assembly of 1682, far from being approved by the head and body of the Church, has been constantly blamed and contradicted by both. An Assembly which presumed by its own authority to strip the decrees of the Sovereign Pontiff of the character of infallibility, would attempt with an ill grace indeed to subject our judgment to its own decision, especially when the consent and approbation of the Church has been formally given. In questions which regard the faith, or the preliminaries of faith, such as is the power of the Church in dogmatical decisions, we freely own, that we know not what is meant by the style and title of the Gallican Church, as it is to us a term without meaning, a word without a corresponding idea, a mere non-entity.”—

Ibid. P. 4th and 5th.

But Mr. Plowden is not the highest autho-

rity I have to adduce on this point. You will, I am sure, receive with due reverence the following decision of your own English Pope, the Rev. Dr. Milner, "*There is not a single Prelate*"—(says that "faithful expositor of the doctrines of your Church," and faithful recorder "of the facts with which they are connected"—so he is styled by you)—"*There is not a single Prelate in England or Ireland, who is not firmly resolved to reject the four Articles of the Gallican Church, commonly called the Gallican Liberties.* We are very far from finding fault with the partizans of the Articles, but we think we see in these Articles the germ of all the present mischief, and, to be brief, we are determined not to subscribe to the Articles."*

* Milner's Supplement to his Pastoral Letter—London, 1809—p. 39. He was at this time, or soon after, the agent and representative of all the Irish Roman-Catholic Bishops. The four Articles of the Gallican Church are here subjoined from Mosheim, cent. xvii. s. 2. part 1.

I. That neither St. Peter nor his successors have received from God any power to interfere, directly or indirectly, in what concerns the temporal interests of Princes and Sovereign States; that Kings and Princes cannot be deposed by ecclesiastical authority, nor their subjects freed from the sacred obligation of fidelity and allegiance, by the power of the Church, or the Bulls of the Roman Pontiff.

II. That the Decrees of the Council of Constance, which re-

And now, Sir, I am afraid I have tired you—I feel that I have tired myself. Only requesting you, therefore, to reconcile these “Variations entre les Catholiques,” I very heartily wish you good night.

present the authority of General Councils as superior to that of the Pope, in spiritual matters, are approved and adopted by the Gallican Church.

III. That the rules, customs, institutions and observances, which have been received in the Gallican Church, are to be preserved inviolable.

IV. That the decisions of the Pope, in points of faith, are not infallible, unless they be attended with the consent of the Church.—p. 155:

LETTER XV.

Conclusion.—Revival of Jesuits and the Inquisition.—Reasonable fears of the Church of Ireland.—Pastorini's Prophecies.—Parting Address to Mr. Butler.

HAVING thus executed my purpose of examining your statement of the doctrines of your Church on the several points enumerated by you, and of endeavouring to vindicate my own Church in the particulars which have been misrepresented, it remains for me only to say a few words before I conclude.

It may, perhaps, be objected, that, although I have disclaimed the intention of writing against “ Catholic Emancipation,” the main part of what I have said, particularly in my latter pages, has a manifest tendency against that measure. If this be the case, I cannot help it. I have sought only to ascertain what are the real dogmas of your Church ; and having executed my purpose, (with whatever success,) I again say, “ let the final bearing of those dogmas on the political question be that, and “ only that, which truth shall warrant.”

In this wish every honourable man, whatever

be his opinions, will readily concur : none more readily, than that Statesman whose authority is most powerful, whose eloquence is most commanding, whose wit is most poignant. Yet we have seen that authority, that eloquence, that wit, exerted to the utmost in giving weight and currency to statements, which are in truth grievously incorrect, but which, whether correct, or otherwise, could not have been examined by him who thus adopted them. Was this to be expected from such a quarter ?

But, it may be asked, are you indeed afraid of the Pope ? Do you think it probable, that they who have long tasted the sweets of liberty, will ever voluntarily resume the fetters they have broken ? For England I have no such fear : other dangers may threaten us from this very measure—but from this I trust that we are free. Not that there is any ground of hope that the spirit of Rome is grown at all more tolerant, less ferocious, or less ambitious. It is declared by its own advocates to be unaltered, and unalterable. The history of ages attests the momentous truth. Twelve hundred years have now passed over the heads of men, since this spiritual tyranny first showed its portentous form : during that period, states and empires have disappeared from the face of the earth ;

but Rome, Papal Rome, is still the same,—still adheres with undiminished zeal to that one subtle, daring system, which, through every variety of power and fortune, it has contrived to cherish, and commonly to advance.

We ourselves have seen it in the most abject state of depression, and have assisted it once more to rear its head, and raise its voice, over the nations which it has enthralled. Has it learned humility and moderation from its fall? Has it not rather sought to re-establish every engine of influence and power, which its means will allow, or the age will tolerate?

The first and favourite act of the late Pontiff, after his deliverance from the bondage of Buonaparte, was to recall the Jesuits from the banishment, to which the common voice of indignant Europe had compelled Clement XIV. to consign them: and Ireland was soon chosen as a fit field for the exercise of their activity.*

* See Dr. Doyle's Evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords, p. 388. One of his answers is so very *appropriate*, that I venture to insert it here.

“ Q. How many Jesuits are established at Clongowes, and
 “ when did they first come there? A. They settled there when
 “ I was upon the Continent; so that I cannot tell exactly the
 “ year. The number of Jesuits in it—as *I believe they are*
 “ *Jesuits in a certain way*—I do not know, but I believe there

Qualis, ubi in lucem coluber mala gramina pastus,
 Frigida sub terrâ tumidum quem bruma tegebat ;
 Nunc positis novus exuviis nitidusque juventâ,
 Lubrica convolvit sublato pectore terga
 Arduus ad solem, et linguis micat ore trisulcis.

I know that you, Sir, and not you alone, but some very liberal persons of our own Church, have taken the fair fame of the Jesuits under their especial protection. It is become a sort of fashion to applaud them ; and to speak of the odium, which has attached itself to their name, as another “vulgar error.”—This is not an occasion, to dwell at length on the merits or demerits of that order : though I shall not be unwilling to enlarge on this topic, whenever

“are fourteen clergymen, who have the care of educating young Gentlemen resident there.”

I add also two other answers on account of the information which they give,—inviting the serious attention of my fellow-Protestants to this matter, when they have read the extracts from the Bull which suppressed this order, and from the Ukases of the present Emperor of Russia.

“Q. What is the extent of their Property there? A. I do not know : *they have a very fine house there* ; but what is the extent of their Property, I do not know.”

“Q. Do you know from what funds, or by whom, the Purchase was made? A. *I believe the Purchase was made by Mr. Kenny, who is one of the Family* ; but the amount of the Purchase-money I do not know.”

you may make it necessary. Meanwhile I present you with some extracts from the Bull which suppressed, and the Bull which revived them; and I leave you to compose this *Bellum Papale* as you may.*

* *Bull of Clement XIV., 21st July, 1773, DOMINUS AC REDEMPTOR NOSTER, for suppressing the Order of Jesuits.*

“WE have omitted no care, no pains, to arrive at a thorough knowledge of the origin, the progress, and the actual state of that Order,” and find that “accusations of the gravest nature, and very detrimental to the peace and tranquillity of the Christian commonwealth, have been continually received against it.” “We have seen, in the grief of our hearts, that neither these remedies (by former Popes) nor an infinity of others since employed, have produced their due effect.” “Discords, dissensions, scandals, which weakening or entirely breaking the bonds of Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party, hatreds, and enmities. Desolation and danger grew to such a height that *the very sovereigns, whose piety and liberality towards the Company were looked on as hereditary, were compelled to drive them from their states, persuaded*

Bull of Pius VII., 7th August, 1814, SOLICITUDO OMNIUM, for reviving the Order of Jesuits.

“WISHING to fulfil the duty of our Apostolic ministry, as soon as Francis Kareu and other secular Priests resident for many years in the vast empire of Russia, who had been members of the Company of Jesus, suppressed by Clement XIV., of happy memory, had supplicated our permission to unite in a body, for the purpose of applying themselves more easily, in conformity with their institution, to the instruction of youth in religion and good morals, to devote themselves to preaching, to confession, and the administration of the other sacraments, we felt it our duty more willingly to comply with their prayer, inasmuch as the then reigning Emperor, Paul I. had recommended the said Priests in his gracious dispatch, dated 11th of August, 1800; and we, on our part, considering attentively the great advantages which these vast regions might

Again, we have witnessed the persecution of the Protestants in the South of France, before

CLEMENT XIV.

that there remained no other remedy to so great evils; and *that this step was necessary in order to prevent Christians from rising one against another, and from massacring each other in the very bosom of our common mother the holy Church.* The said our dear sons in Jesus Christ having since considered, that even this remedy would not be sufficient towards reconciling the whole Christian world, unless the said Society was absolutely suppressed—made known their demands to our predecessor, Clement XIII. They united their common prayers and authority to obtain that this last method might be put in practice, as the only one capable of assuring the constant repose of their subjects, and the good of the Catholic church in general. Actuated by so many and important considerations, and, as we hope, aided by the presence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, compelled beside by the necessity of our ministry, which strictly obliges us to conciliate, maintain, and confirm the peace and tranquillity of the Christian commonwealth, and remove every obstacle which may tend to trouble it—having further considered, &c. that, *it was very*

PIUS VII.

thence derive; considering how useful those ecclesiastics, *whose morals and doctrine were equally tried*, would be to the Catholic religion,” “authorized them to resume and follow the rule of St. Ignatius of Loyola, in order that the Companions might freely engage in the instruction of youth in religion and good letters, direct seminaries and colleges, and, with the consent of the Ordinary, confess, preach the word of God, and administer the Sacraments.” “The Catholic world demands with unanimous voice the reestablishment of the Company of Jesus.” “We should deem ourselves guilty of a great crime towards God, if, amidst these dangers of the Christian commonwealth, we neglected the aids which the special providence of God has put at our disposal; and if, placed in the bark of Peter, tossed and assailed by continual storms, we refuse to employ the vigorous and experienced rowers who volunteer their services, in order to break the waves of a sea, which threatens every moment shipwreck and death.” “We have decreed, that all the concessions and powers, granted by us solely to the Russian empire and the kingdom of the two Sicilies, shall henceforth

the persecutors themselves were secure in the enjoyment of their own power,—we have wit-

CLEMENT XIV.

difficult, not to say impossible, that the Church should recover a firm and durable peace so long as the said society subsisted, after mature deliberation, we do, &c. **SUPPRESS AND ABOLISH THE SAID COMPANY :** *we deprive it of all activity whatever, of its houses, schools, colleges, hospitals, lands, &c."* "None of them who shall become sēcular Priests or Clerks shall exercise the holy function of confessing and preaching without a permission in writing; nor shall the Bishops or Ordinaries grant such permission to such of the Society, who shall remain in the colleges or houses heretofore belonging to the Society, to whom we expressly and forever prohibit the administration of the Sacrament of *penance* (in which, of course, *confession* was included) and the function of preaching." "Further we will that *if any shall be desirous of dedicating themselves to the instruction of youth in any college or school, care be taken that they have no part in the government or direction of the same.* In a word, the faculty of teaching youth shall neither be granted nor preserved, but to those who seem inclined to maintain peace in the schools, and tranquillity in the world."

PIUS VII.

extend to all other states." "We declare besides, and grant power that *they may freely and lawfully apply to the education of youth in the principles of the Catholic faith, to form them to good morals, and to direct colleges and seminaries; we authorize them to hear confessions, to preach, &c.* In fine, we recommend strongly in the Lord, the Company and all its members to our dear sons in Jesus Christ, the illustrious and noble Princes and Lords temporal, &c.; we exhort, we conjure them, not to suffer that these religious be in any way molested, but to watch that they be treated with all due kindness and charity, &c. &c."

The present Pope, Leo. XII., in a brief dated August 5th, 1824, bears honourable testimony to the Jesuits, and especially to "*their fitness for the good education of youth,* as the most prompt and only means to reform men."

In order to make the whole view of the character of these

nessed too the various laws by which the interests of Rome are continually advancing in

modern Jesuits complete, I will add some extracts from two Ukases of the present Emperor of Russia, respecting those very persons, whose merits are made by Pius VII. a main ground of the revival of the order.

In an Ukase, bearing date January 2d, 1816, having enumerated most flagrant instances of their abuse of the confidence reposed in them, such as follow : “ to induce a man to abjure “ *his faith*, the faith of his ancestors, to extinguish in him the “ love of those who profess the same worship, *to render him a “ stranger to his country*, to sow divisions and discord in families, to detach the brother from the brother, the son from the “ father,” &c. the Emperor thus expresses himself, “ After such actions, we are no longer surprised that the order of these monks has been removed from all countries, and no where tolerated. In fact, *what state can suffer in its bosom those who spread in its bosom hate and disorder ?* Considering it as a wise and sacred duty to stop the evil in its origin, *that it may not grow to maturity, and bring forth bitter fruits*, we have resolved to ordain, 1, That all the monks of the order of the Jesuits immediately quit St. Petersburg ; 2, That they do not enter our two capitals. We have given orders to our ministers of police, and public instruction, for the prompt execution of this determination.”

A second Ukase issued on March 20th, 1820.

“ His Majesty the Emperor has approved, on the 18th of this month, of a report from the Minister of Worship and Public Instruction,” which, after referring to the former Ukase, thus proceeds :

“ *The Jesuits, although sufficiently warned by the animadversions which they had incurred, did not change their conduct.* But the minister thinks it his duty to submit to the Emperor a

that great kingdom,—not least the latest law of sacrilege.

Lastly, and above all, we have witnessed the revival of that accursed instrument of spiritual tyranny, which no English Protestant, even in the security of his own land, can think on without horror. The office of the Inquisition, which owed its vigour at least, if not its birth, to the same Pontiff, who convened the great Laterane Council, and there devised those decrees against heretics which nothing but such an institution could execute,—that Inquisition which Paul IV. ascribed to the especial inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and with his dying breath commended to his Cardinals as *essential to the very existence of the authority of the Church*: that Inquisition is again in being, not in Spain only, but in Italy. Need I say more? The monster lives!

Surely, Sir, all these “signs of the times” may justify some apprehension,—not for England I trust; for here, the first outrageous as-

system of provisions: 1, The definitive banishment of the Jesuits beyond the frontiers of the empire, with a prohibition of re-entering under any form; 2, The suppression of the Academy of Jesuits at Polotsk, and of its dependent schools.”

Such was the conduct, and such the end of these exemplary men, whose merit was made by Pius VII. a main plea, I repeat, for reviving their order; such too, I may add, is the order which has now very powerful establishments in this country and in Ireland.

sertion of Papal power, the first demand of any thing inconsistent with genuine loyalty and fidelity to the state, would be met by the scorn of all, and by the open defection of many, of those honourable names, which still adhere to your communion. But for Ireland, situated as that country is, what sober mind will venture to pronounce with equal confidence? Be it granted, that there are conflicting dangers,—that many true friends of the reformed Church see greater mischiefs likely to befall that Church from continuing the civil disabilities to which your brethren are subjected, than from removing them:—this is a question into which I will not here enter. Still, surely, we cannot wonder, much less can we blame, if the Irish Protestant discerns in the measures which Rome is even now elsewhere taking, an indication of the danger which a little increase of her power at home may bring to his own door. Such an apprehension is not diminished by witnessing the facility with which the first flimsy statement by any artful apologist of your Church is heard and believed,—nay, made a ground for yielding, with an express recantation of former errors, whatever hitherto had been deemed most sacred.

As little can they derive assurance and encouragement from the treatment which their

own* Church every day receives,—from the ready ear too generally turned to every insinuation against the zeal, the piety, or the usefulness of its ministers,—from the gross exaggerations of its wealth, which are perpetually current, even in those places where true information is most to be expected, and false is most pernicious,—lastly, from the little sympathy ever given to its reasonable fears, and the little disposition ever shewn to discourage the turbulence of its rival, so long as it is directed against the Church alone. When Irish Churchmen see and meditate on these things, and then look back on the history of their country, they cannot be expected to view without terror the

* It is true that the Church of Ireland suffers in this respect in common with the Church of England; but I fervently wish, that the blows levelled at the former were as innocuous as those aimed at the latter. While on this subject, I may be allowed to remark on the last—calumny, I suppose I must not call it—vented against the clergy of the Church of England. All the newspapers report that in a late debate every beneficed clergyman was charged with perjury, inasmuch as on institution to his benefice, “ he solemnly declares before “ God that he feels inwardly moved at that very instant by the “ Holy Ghost, to accept the office and administration thereof, “ and that he accepts it for no other reason whatsoever.” To that statement, I beg to be understood as giving the strongest contradiction that is consistent with good manners. In short, there never was a more utterly unfounded assertion ascribed to the quarter, whence this proceeded.

prospect of any change, which shall encrease the power of their ambitious and unrelenting foe. I can figure to myself that insulted, vilified, and *threatened* Church, prostrating herself at the bar of either House of Parliament, and invoking the spirit of British legislation to save her from the impending danger. "True," she may say, "my sons are few in number, but they are your brethren, of the same household of faith with yourselves;—true, the pious wisdom of your ancestors has placed me in affluence and plenty,—but that affluence is employed, not in pampering luxury, but in dispensing over the land, which so many other proprietors have deserted, the blessings of civilization, justice, and charity; and even were it not so, yet property, as such, property unstained by crime, was not wont to be an object of hostile legislation to a British senate.* But let this pass. I deprecate no severity, in which an assembly of Protestants can be persuaded to join;—one only

* "As to Catholic emancipation," an Hon. Member of the House of Commons is stated to have said, "if no other benefit was to accrue from the measure, but *the transfer of the tithes collected from the Catholic people to the Catholic Church*, he should consider it *an act of justice* and sound policy." See Debates, 5th February, 1825. It can hardly be necessary to add, that another Hon. Member has pledged himself to pursue the downfall of the Irish Church, while he may have the faintest prospect of succeeding.

“ thing I pray—decide concerning me as you
 “ will, but, decide yourselves,—call not to
 “ your councils, those by whom my existence
 “ is even now openly denounced as a public
 “ curse, and my very days are numbered:
 “ *hanc veniam supplicii des, ut ipse, quodcunque*
 “ *fert animus, de me statuas, neque me in cujus-*
 “ *quam Romani superbum ac crudele arbitrium*
 “ *venire sinas.*”

These, Sir, are the sentiments which the Church of Ireland cannot but feel under the dangers which press upon her. That they ought to overpower all other considerations connected with the question, I do not presume to say: but at least it may be hoped, that in every breast where justice has a place, they will be allowed their due weight, will be acknowledged to demand some better security, than the oath inserted in the bill now before Parliament, an oath which seems even to point to the Roman Catholic the fitness of overturning the establishment of the present Church, if he be content that his own shall not succeed in its place.*

* “ And I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure,
 “ any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment,
 “ *for the purpose of substituting a Roman-Catholic establishment*
 “ *in its stead.*” The Oath proceeds to say, “ I will never exercise
 “ any privilege, &c. to *disturb* the Protestant Religion, (not
 “ Church) or Protestant government in this kingdom.” This
 be it remembered, may be made exactly to accord with the
 wishes of I. K. L.

Forgive me if I add one other very obvious consideration, which seems to have been thought unworthy even of notice in the recent discussions of this question, I mean *the Prophecy of Pastorini*,* (really of an English Roman-Catholic Bishop named Walmsley,) that in this particular year, in the year 1825, the cause of Protestantism shall be subverted, the reign of the locusts shall cease, “the vial shall be poured out upon the Kings and Governors who sit, vested with power, upon the thrones of those heretical kingdoms,” and “the Protestant states themselves shall be involved with their Princes in the calamities which ensue.”

*“General History of the Christian Church, chiefly deduced from the Apocalypse of St. John, by Sig. Pastorini.” Dublin. By Wogan. 1812.

“When one reflects that of the three hundred years allowed to the reign of the locusts, there remain only fifty or fifty five to run,† one cannot but wish, with an earnest heart, that the people represented by those insects would enter into a serious consideration of that circumstance.” p. 227.

“But if, deaf to all admonitions, they continue hardened in their own way, what remains to be done but to lament their misfortune, and, in bitterness of soul, turn our eyes from the pouring out of the following vial?” page 229.

“Upon the throne therefore of this beast, (the heresy of the Reformation,) the vial is poured out, that is, upon the Kings and Governors of the Protestant States, as they are the persons that sit vested with power upon the thrones of those heretical Kingdoms.” *ibid.*

† This work was printed in the year 1771.

Now, Sir, I am as ready to admit, as you can be to claim, the right of your commentators on the Apocalypse to draw from that Book any Prophecy which they honestly think is there delivered. Divines of our own Church have repeatedly exercised that right, and, whether wisely, or otherwise, have ventured to specify certain periods, nay even certain years, for the downfall of the Church of Rome. Your right, in this respect, is clearly as good as ours. Neither is it necessary for my argument, that I should condemn (as, however, I certainly do condemn) the diffusion of this notion among the rude and easily excited population of a country like Ireland. But I am content to take the fact as I find it, without ascribing blame to any one. And I then ask, whether it be prudent to minister any stimulants to the frenzy and fanaticism which must necessarily accompany the belief of such a prediction? much more to do that, which by minds so heated must be deemed a partial, but, unhappily, only a partial fulfilment of it?*

* The Rev. Henry Cook (Moderator of the Synod of Ulster) says in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords, p. 342, that “ *almost one and all of the common people understood by Catholic Emancipation a division of property, a restoration of the forfeited estates, of which many of them lay claim to be the heirs.*”

dient to pacify and conciliate Ireland? to induce the people to acquiesce in any arrangement which Parliament may devise? Would it not rather give them fresh spirit and energy, in the attempt to realize for themselves the whole of that prediction, which Providence, they would think, had half accomplished to their hands?*

But I turn from the political question to matters more closely connected with ourselves.

It is possible, that on reference to my promise made in my first letter, you may complain of my having sometimes addressed you with less of respect—perhaps even with more of positive severity—than you may think I gave you reason to expect. To this I can only answer, that if you have been in some measure

* Dr. Doyle says, (p. 399) (and I am far from doubting his sincerity,) that he has strongly condemned the prophesy, and discountenanced the circulation of it. Mr. O'Connell ascribes the circulation (which he admits to have been considerable) to Protestants, and *thinks that no effect has been produced upon the lower orders of the Irish Roman Catholics by these prophesies!*—*Report of Lords' Committee*, p. 262. If Mr. O'Connell's opinion is really well founded, the Irish populace, under all the circumstances of the times, must be the most sluggish race in existence. Whether this be their character let experience inform us,

disappointed, I have not been less so. I hoped, when I began, that I should be able to execute my purpose in a manner more satisfactory to my own feelings towards you. But I will not dissemble, that on a closer inspection of your work I found it much feebler in argument, and much more reprehensible on other accounts, than my first perusal of it (for it was on a first perusal that I thought it worth a comment) had induced me to suppose. In truth, as a specimen of reasoning, (where you affect to reason,) it falls so very far below what might have been hoped from you, that you must be content to see its weakness laid bare. Happily, you can afford this. You have a high reputation in an important branch of a most honourable profession—a reputation which must make you a considerable man, whether you are able to adorn it with literary honours or not. But even in literature, your praise is not of a low order. You are an elegant and pleasing writer; one who always says well what he has to say: and if on this particular occasion, on matters of polemical theology, you have had little worth saying, you may solace yourself with the assurance, that by choosing a subject better adapted to your information, you can easily redeem a failure which has indeed been too manifest.

This must be my answer to any complaint against my occasionally treating you with some appearance of disrespect. For the other matter, for the implied, and, in one or two instances, expressed, suspicions of your disingenuousness, I have, as yet, no apology to make, no explanation to offer. I have thought you disingenuous, and I have told you so; but in terms below, rather than above, the conviction of my own mind. Prove that I have suspected you erroneously, and I will be ready to retract my suspicion; prove that I have suspected without fair cause, and you shall see me sue for your pardon in the face of that public, before whom I have given you the offence. But are you not conscious to yourself (I will not say of dishonourable dealing, for any thing that might appear to yourself dishonourable would, I am sure, have been rejected at once)—but are you not conscious of some degree of craft and management, which, if you were not quite sure your cause is a holy one, would have been less satisfactory to your own mind than, I doubt not, you found it? Alas! it is this readiness to regard too exclusively the end of our labours, without watching with constant jealousy the means we use in effecting it, that is the cause

of more than half the misconduct, into which good and even conscientious men will sometimes fall. Forgive me, if I regard your instance as a warning; and if I call on all those who read what has passed between us, to beware of any the slightest indulgence in that dangerous habit, which has betrayed even Mr. Butler into duplicity, misrepresentation, and slander.

To yourself it would be presumption in me to tender any advice; but what I presume not to advise, I may be permitted to hope.—I hope, then, that when next you undertake to assert the cause of your Church, you will not be content with satisfying yourself that that Church is so true, and all its doctrines so sound, that, whatever line of argument you adopt in its defence, you cannot greatly offend in using it; that a little concealment, or a little exaggeration, a little over-colouring, or a little shading and softening, (as occasion may prompt,) cannot be unjustifiable in arguing with those whose minds are not yet ripe for the full admission of truth.

I hope, that you will rather take a lesson from the principles which direct your own conduct in life, from that simplicity and singleness of purpose and of act, without which you could

not have acquired, much less have retained, the warm regard which all who know you are accustomed to feel for you.

For myself, I dare not assert that I have in no instance fallen into the error here condemned:—but this I will say, that I have earnestly and strenuously endeavoured to avoid it;—that I have rejected every opportunity of strengthening my argument, which appeared to me in any degree unjust or uncandid. May He, who alone fully knows the deceitfulness of the heart of man,—He, of whom, while employed in this poor work, I have humbly besought protection from that sin which does so easily beset all who engage in controversy,—may He grant that, if I have erred, the error be not long concealed from me! Should you, Sir, be the instrument of correcting me for it, I trust I shall kiss your rod and be thankful.

HENRY PHILLPOTTS.

April, 1825.

NOTE to page 54.

THROUGH the kindness of the Rev. Dr. Bandinell, Librarian of the Bodleian Library—a gentleman whose zealous assistance to the literary pursuits of others is rendered doubly valuable by the courtesy with which it is given—I have now obtained a copy of “the Duchess of York’s Reasons for changing her Religion.” The date of the paper is August 20, 1670: but it does not appear to have been published till ten or eleven years afterwards, when her Royal Highness had been long dead. Evelyn, ii. p. 109, seems to cast a doubt on its genuineness; for he says (1st June, 1681), in a letter to Bishop Morley, “Father Maimbourg has had the impudence to publish, at the end of his late *Histoire du Calvinisme*, a *pretended* letter of the late Dutchesse of York,” &c.: but its genuineness seems to be established beyond dispute by its being found among Lord Clarendon’s own papers, and transcribed by the hand of her brother, Lord Cornbury.

In this paper she speaks of “two of the most learned Bishops of England” (Morley of Winchester, as it was supposed, and Blandford, of Worcester, to whom, in succession, her spiritual instruction had been entrusted) as having expressed to her some opinions in favour of certain doctrines of the Church of Rome. The publication of this paper by Maimbourg caused Bishop Morley to give to the world a long letter of remonstrance, which he had addressed to the Duchess, before her paper of Reasons was written, and which contains not only the amplest vindication of himself, but also unhappily proves the grievous insincerity of the perverted Lady.

In consequence of this, Bishop Morley's authority is, I believe, never claimed in favour of the Church of Rome. But Blandford had been long dead, and "dead men tell no tales," therefore his name continues to figure in a prominent manner among the Protestant vouchers for such doctrines as it is found convenient thus to protect.

Of this letter of Morley, dated January, 1670, there is a copy, indorsed by the hand of Lord Clarendon himself. There is, besides, a most able and pathetic letter written by that illustrious exile himself to his daughter; and another, full of respectful but manly remonstrance to the Duke, on occasion of the rumours which had reached him concerning the change in her Royal Highness's religious faith. These are dated in 1668.

The last paper in the series is a letter by Lord Cornbury to the Duke of York on the same subject, dated December 26, 1670.

They are all so full of interest, that I had purposed to print them here entire; but the great space, which they would occupy, forbids me. I trust, however, that the public will soon obtain them by some other channel.

APPENDIX.

A

LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE EARL GREY,

OCCASIONED BY

His Lordship's Speech in the House of Lords, on moving the
Second Reading of his Bill for Abrogating the Declarations
contained in the 25th and 30th of Charles II., commonly
called "The Test against Popery."



LETTER TO EARL GREY,

&c. &c.

MY LORD,

THE liberal indulgence of both Houses of Parliament, in permitting their proceedings to be communicated to the public, while on the one hand it has largely contributed to enlighten the minds of the people, by informing them of the views and principles of their Rulers, has, on the other hand, ensured a degree of circulation, and consequently of importance, to every speech delivered in Parliament, which it could not otherwise have obtained. Hence it sometimes becomes necessary to animadvert without doors on the arguments, or opinions, issuing from so great a place, and disseminated on so high authority. When this is done with decency and due respect, your Lordship will, I am sure, be among the last to object that it is also done with freedom; even though your own sentiments may occasionally be made the subject of remark. It cannot indeed be matter of surprise, if this should more frequently happen to your Lordship, than to almost any other member of the British Senate. Placed at the head of one of the most powerful of our political parties, eminently distin-

guished by talents and eloquence, and, above all, by a character for political and private honour, which stamps an additional value on all your high endowments, you can hardly bring forward any subject of discussion in Parliament, without exciting the curiosity and fixing the attention of the nation at large. It is with this conviction of the important influence of any sentiments, which bear the sanction of your Lordship's name, that I presume to address to you some remarks on the Speech with which you lately introduced a Motion for the second reading of your Bill to repeal so much of the 25th and 30th Ch. II. as relates to the Declarations therein required.

Your Lordship need not be apprehensive, that I am about to obtrude upon you an argument on what is commonly called the Catholic Question. That Question seems to me so purely political; it is beset on both sides with so many difficulties, and involves so many conflicting considerations, which men of my profession are little likely, either from their studies or their habits, to appreciate correctly, that I would at all times rather avoid than court its discussion. On the wisdom of Parliament, and on its steady and approved attachment to the established Church, I confidently rely, that whatever course be finally adopted, whether of withholding or of granting what is asked, the real interests of that Church will always be regarded as of prime and fundamental importance; that no motive of temporary expediency will be deemed sufficient to justify a departure from the standing policy of the British Constitution; and that no concessions will be made, which Parliament, in its deliberate judgment, shall not find compatible with

the security of the Church, and its permanent union with the State.

But while I disclaim alike both the intention and the ability of discussing the political Question, I am the more emboldened to exercise my right of considering freely those religious topics, which unnecessarily, and, in my opinion, somewhat injudiciously, have been dragged into the discussion. Pardon me, my Lord, when I say, that your Lordship's late Speech seems to me peculiarly open to this remark; that it abounds with positions wholly untenable, and with facts greatly misapprehended; that, in short, it affords a striking illustration of the danger, from which no strength of talents or splendour of eloquence can exempt their possessor, when he ventures on a field of argument which is foreign to his ordinary pursuits.

It is my intention to adduce the evidence, on which I rest this charge; as well as to animadvert on some positions advanced by other Noble Lords who bore a part in the debate, particularly by one, who supported your Lordship's motion at the greatest length. Permit me, however, first, to make a single observation on your Bill itself.

The reason professed by your Lordship for wishing to repeal the Declarations in question was simply this, that they contain, in your opinion, an unjust, and, at any rate, a needless and wanton outrage on the feelings of several millions of our fellow-subjects. You ask, "if it be necessary to exclude Roman Catholics from office and power, is it likewise necessary to denounce their belief and revile their worship? Must it not be galling

to that body, not only to be denied the privileges, to which their fellow-subjects are admitted, but to hear themselves branded as the votaries of a blind superstition, and the partizans of an idolatrous worship?"

On these questions your Lordship would, I apprehend, find few persons disposed to differ from you. But, what may justly excite astonishment is, that so acute a mind as your Lordship's, if you were really in earnest (as doubtless you were) in seeking the object, which you professed, and had no ulterior hopes of obtaining by management what had so recently been refused when more directly sought, should not have devised a measure better calculated for its purpose. You were well aware, that the Oath of Supremacy has not been regarded either by Parliament or the Country as a sufficient security against the admission of Roman Catholics into the legislature; that some further Test, which no member of the Church of Rome shall be able to take, has hitherto been deemed indispensable; and that the only value of the existing Declarations is, that they constitute such a Test. Since this was the case, why was it not attempted rather to improve the Terms of these Declarations, than to repeal them? to remove the offensive phrases, and to substitute others, which might equally secure the object for which the Test is retained?

That this was both possible, and very easy, was shown by a Noble Earl,* who spoke and voted on the same side with your Lordship. He well observed, that "the venerable men, who had deliberately framed

* The Earl of Harrowby.

the Articles of the Church of England, had not called Transubstantiation and the Adoration of Saints by such violent and abusive names, as were used by the framers of the Declaration Oath in the midst of the senseless panic arising out of a pretended Plot." Your Lordship will not be surprised that, as a Churchman, I should be proud of this example of wise and effectual moderation, derived from the conduct of the Governors of the Church, and standing in honourable contrast to the unnecessary violence of a Parliamentary enactment. Had this example been imitated in the Bill introduced by your Lordship, your professed object might easily have been provided for, without alarming the known apprehensions of those who consider an efficient Test as still necessary.

For there is, it must be confessed, a palpable anomaly in exacting from civil officers a much more violent declaration against these religious tenets, than is required as a qualification even for admittance into holy orders. Of the Invocation of Saints, the Ministers of the Church of England need only believe, that it is "a fond thing, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." Every member of either House of Parliament must go further; he must declare in the presence of God that it is superstitious and idolatrous. The Sacrifice of the Mass is condemned by the Article in stronger terms; still it is not called idolatrous: nor could it be necessary for the purpose of a Test, to require a more violent disclaimer of this tenet, than of the former.

I repeat, therefore, that it is hardly to be imagined that a hearty endeavour to lower the Terms of the

Declaration to the standard of the Articles of the Church would have been met with serious opposition. Your Lordship thought proper to pursue a different course; and the consequence was, what most persons anticipated, that your Bill was rejected by a much larger majority, than had negatived, a month before, the open and avowed application for a removal of all the disabilities, which affect the Roman Catholics.

From this remark on the Bill itself, I proceed to a consideration of your Lordship's and some other Speeches made in support of it; strictly confining myself, however, to the theological topics. For while I willingly admit, that the object of the Declaration, considered as a Test, might be equally obtained by adopting a milder form, yet I hold the propositions, as they now stand, to be not only true, but of main importance to the cause of pure religion; and it is because their truth has been assailed both by sarcasm and by argument, that I feel it my duty to trouble your Lordship with my present address.

One of the most striking characteristics of your Speech is a readiness to inculcate the notion, that there is, in reality, very little difference of doctrine between the Churches of England and of Rome. The attempt is not a new one. It has long been the usage of the most wary advocates of the latter Church, when defending their cause before the Protestants both of this country and of France, to state their tenets, and describe their practices, in a manner the least offensive to the principles of those whom they address. Such a policy, restrained within the bounds of truth and sincerity, would merit nothing but commendation. These,

however, are not restraints, which the writers of that Communion have always thought it necessary to observe. From the age of Bossuet to the present time, there have never been wanting men, who will strain, or compress, the doctrines of their Church to whatever point the interests of the day may require : and if the more staunch and artless believers are sometimes shocked by the latitude in which they indulge, it is seldom difficult to prevent or to palliate the scandal of an open rupture.

The success of this policy is much promoted by the impossibility of appealing to any authentic and complete Confession of the Faith of their Church. Even the Decrees of the Council of Trent, however commonly referred to as containing such a Confession, are found in fact to present a very imperfect sketch. Many important particulars were there studiously expressed in language the most equivocal ; in order, if not to satisfy the wishes, at least to silence the opposition, of the various conflicting parties, which disputed on almost every point. And, even when the Council was least divided, the agents of Rome often found their account in involving the expressions of the Decrees in purposed obscurity : for the right of interpreting the doubtful Decrees of Councils has long been strenuously asserted by the Papal See. But, on the other hand, as this right has been no less strenuously denied, especially by the Gallican Church, which has not seldom taken upon itself to resolve its own doubts, we have here another most abundant source of difficulty in ascertaining the doctrines really affirmed by this celebrated Council. The last cause, which I need mention, but not the least

important, is, that many tenets cannot fairly be estimated by the words in which they are expressed, even when those words are not in themselves obscure : for instance, what is the due honour and veneration to be paid to Images and Relics, or the true nature of the Invocation of Saints, and the worship that may be addressed to them, can only be learned by marking the customs and instituted observances of different countries within the Roman Pale.

It is an obvious consequence of this uncertainty, that a skilful sophist may easily frame a statement of the doctrines of his Church, plausible enough to impose on any one who forms his notions of the true character of Popery from the manner in which it is presented to his observation in a Protestant country. But that your Lordship should be deceived by such an artifice is only a fresh instance of the ease, with which the most powerful minds can suffer themselves to be blinded by their own prejudices. If no political bias had influenced your judgment, it would have been impossible for you to overlook the wide and irremovable barrier, which separates the tenets of your own Church from the corruptions of Rome. You could not have forgotten, that the majority of our Articles are framed in direct opposition to those corruptions ; that in what relates to the Rule of Christian Faith,—to man's justification,—to the nature of good works, whether they be meritorious,—to the Church, its fallibility and its authority,—to the duty of religious worship, whether it is to be confined to God, or communicated to the Virgin Mary, Angels, or Saints,—to the Adoration of Images and Relics,—to common Prayer in language understood by all,—to

the Sacraments, their number, matter, form, and efficacy,—to the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and the perfect propitiation and satisfaction wrought by it for the sins of men,—to his mediation and intercession for us with the Father,—that in all and every of these particulars there are irreconcilable differences between the two Churches. In short, you could not thus have been made an instrument to revive mis-statements, which have been long exploded; nor have lent the high support, not merely of your name and character, but also of your talents and your eloquence, to a cause, the merits of which seem absolutely unheeded by you.

But your Lordship gives an authority for this view of the near accordance of the two churches, which you might well expect would have decisive influence in an Assembly of British Protestants. You “beg leave to call the attention of their Lordships to a letter of Archbishop Wake. That Reverend Divine had engaged in a controversy with the Doctors of the Sorbonne, but had candidly admitted, that in many things the Church of England and the Church of Rome maintained the same doctrines and practised similar rites.—The attachment of this Divine to his country, his loyalty to his Sovereign, and his conscientious adherence to the tenets of the Church, of which he was at the head, could not be doubted; and yet he admitted, that in a comparison between the Church of England and Church of Rome, their articles of faith differed very little, their discipline still less, and that in fundamentals they were nearly the same. After such a declaration from such an authority, could their Lordships with a safe conscience concur in reviling the Religion of the Roman Catholics?”

If, my Lord, it could otherwise be doubted, whether you had made your representation of the resemblance of the two Churches on the authority of some most disingenuous guide, this quotation would have decided the point. There is in it, indeed, just the due admixture of truth to give to the falsehood, which is its main characteristic, the fullest temporary effect. It is true, that Archbishop Wake had engaged in a controversy with some Members of the Church of Rome, and that he wrote to a Doctor of the Sorbonne the sentence which your Lordship quotes: but it is not true, that he wrote thus either to, or of, those with whom he had been in controversy: nor, which is more important, that the alleged admission at all respected the doctrines of that Church. The real history of the matter was shortly this:—

During the violent proceedings of the Court of Rome against that part of the Gallican Church, which refused to receive the Bull “Unigenitus” as an ecclesiastical law, some Doctors of the Sorbonne, particularly Du Pin, the ablest and most distinguished among them,—whether from a sincere intention of shaking off the Papal yoke, which seemed to be borne with some impatience throughout France, or merely with the hope and purpose of terrifying the Vatican into better treatment of themselves, or perhaps from a mixture of both these motives,—testified their wish for a reconciliation with the Church of England. Archbishop Wake, to whom this intimation was conveyed, answered, as became a Christian Bishop, in terms which at once bespoke his anxious desire of peace and union, and his inflexible

constancy in the cause of truth.* In the progress of the correspondence, the French Divines began to form a plan of union, and even to state the terms on which they were willing to effect it. Du Pin drew up a paper, entitled “*Commonitorium de Modis ineundæ pacis inter Ecclesias Anglicanam et Gallicanam.*” Without entering largely into the contents of this document, (a copy of which is still extant among the Wake MSS. in the library of Christ Church, Oxford,) it may be sufficient to say, that it examined separately the Articles of the Church of England, specifying the extent to which agreement with them could be carried; and that in many important particulars great concessions were made. Especially, the sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for salvation, with a slight salvo for Tradition, as not exhibiting new articles of Faith, but only confirming and illustrating those contained in Scripture,—Justification by Faith alone,—the fallibility even of the Church of Rome, considered as a particular Church,—were freely admitted. Indulgences were limited to relaxations of temporal penances *in this life*; the worship of the cross, relics, and images, was reduced to an external respect, and that not of a religious nature; the Invocation of Saints seems to have been given up; the fitness of celebrating divine worship in the vulgar tongue was not disputed; the Communion in both kinds was held indifferent; and in the Article of the Supremacy of the civil Magistrate some not inconsiderable points were conceded. Even Transubstantiation (though the doctrine, without the name, was affirmed) seems to have

* See an account of the whole of this transaction in Appendix III. to Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History.

been retained only as a speculative point, without involving the duties of adoring the Host, or those other consequences which have made it so justly revolting to all considerate Protestants. “In our liturgy,” says Wake himself in a letter to his English correspondent, “there is nothing but what they allow of, save the single rubric relating to the Eucharist; in theirs nothing but what they agree may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse, or more imperfect for want of it.”

Still, notwithstanding these advances, the Archbishop was not very sanguine in his expectation of a re-union. Without the entire exclusion of the Papal authority from the Church of France, he despaired of an effectual accommodation; with it he hoped for every thing. This therefore was the point, to which he directed his main efforts: but this, he plainly saw, could only be accomplished through the co-operation of the Court.—Some prospect of such a co-operation was for a while presented. The Regent and his Minister shewed themselves favourable: but the artifices of Rome prevailed; and the attraction of a Cardinal’s hat for the infamous Du Bois was sufficient to extinguish the dawn of reformation in France, almost as soon as it had arisen.

It was after the Archbishop’s hopes of the assistance of the Court had proved illusory, that he wrote to Du Pin the letter,* from which your Lordship’s quotation

* The following is a copy of the main parts of the letter. No. xv.

Speraveram equidem tuâ auctoritate, constantiâ, eruditione, pietate, moderatione, quæ omnia adeo in te perfecta esse noscuntur, ut vix in aliis singula, præclari aliquid ad Dei gloriam Ecclesiæque Gallicanæ utilitatem perfici potuisse. Credideram advenisse tempus, in quo, excusso Romanæ Tyrannidis iugo, una nobiscum in eandem

was taken ;—and I may now venture to ask, whether any thing more fallacious can be devised, than to represent the language of Wake addressed, under such circumstances, to Du Pin, as intended to characterize the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome. That your Lordship is incapable of knowingly becoming a party in such an imposture, I am well aware : and if the guide, whoever he may be, who has thus grossly misled you, shall appear to you less worthy of your confidence in future, the trouble of reading these pages will not have been entirely thrown away.

Archbishop Wake, my Lord, would have been among the last to be seduced into any approval of the corruptions of Rome. He was a man eminent indeed for the truly Christian benevolence which directed his life, his actions, and his thoughts ; kind towards the persons of all from whom he differed ; a lover and a cultivator of peace, but of that genuine peace, which never can be purchased by a surrender of the truth. He was early and long engaged in controversy with the papists ; and of all the great Divines, who stood forward in defence of the Church of England in that protracted and memorable contest, he, after Stillingfleet, was at once the most profoundly skilled in the learning, the most acute, solid, and judicious, in the argument of his cause. His

communione coalesceretis. In dogmatibus, prout a te candidè proponuntur, non admodum dissentimus : in regimine Ecclesiastico minus : in fundamentalibus, sive doctrinam sive disciplinam spectemus, vix omnino. Quam facilis erat ab his initiis ad concordiam progressus, modo animos haberemus ad pacem compositos ! Sed hoc principibus sæculi non arridet, Unionis inimicis etiam plurimum displicet, &c.

gentle spirit led him to be moderate; but to convince you how he really thought and wrote of the Church of Rome, I will beg leave to add one or two quotations from his works in return for yours.

The charge of idolatry is repeatedly enforced by him; and that not incidentally, and by the way, but directly and argumentatively. The title of one of his chapters is as follows: "That the Church of Rome thus worshipping of images, is truly and properly guilty of idolatry."*

Of the Invocation of Saints, after shewing largely that it is "repugnant to God's word, contrary to antiquity, unreasonable, senseless, and unprofitable:"—"but I insist," says he, "too long on these reflections. I add only, to close all, that this invocation of Saints is as impious as it is unprofitable; for first, to take this practice in the most moderate sense that may be,"† &c.

Of the Adoration of the Host, he says, that "the Church of England, consequently to her principles of the Bread and Wine remaining in their natural substances, professes that she thinks it to be *Idolatry*, and to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."‡

Of the Sacrifice of the Mass, that it "both makes up the chiefest part of the Popish worship and is justly esteemed one of the greatest and most dangerous errors that offend us."§

* See Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England. Art. IV. S. 3.

† See the same. Art. III. S. 4.

‡ See Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England. Art. XX.

§ See the same. Art. XXI.

This, my Lord, is only a sample of the opinions of that eminent prelate, whom you have been seduced to quote as a favourer of those doctrines, which he thus condemns. I will conclude with stating what he says of such persons as those who have beguiled your Lordship. "When I see men so industrious in expounding the doctrines of their church into a sense that may come as near the Reformation as is possible; when for the doing of this they are forced to so many shifts as plainly shew there is something of violence in the undertaking; words forced from their natural signification," &c. "It is one of my chiefest crimes, and for which I perceive there is no indulgence to be expected, that I have in some measure endeavoured to bring these designs to light; to shew that all this is indeed but a lure to draw men in, and that when once they are ensnared, they will then find things to be far otherwise than they are made at first to believe: or that if they are in good earnest in their present pretences, then they herein plainly depart from what their church once held, and are upon that very account esteemed by others of their communion at this day to be little better than protestant Heretics."*

But besides the assertion of the general resemblance between the two Churches, your Lordship has been induced to say in particular that "the doctrine of Transubstantiation, *which is declared to be idolatrous*, does not differ so widely from the doctrine of the Protestants on the same subject, as to authorise them to declare thus strongly against it: that the text of Scripture,

* See Preface to Second Defence.

from which the Roman Catholics deduce their doctrine, is interpreted by our own and other Churches with so slight shades of difference, that the generality of those, who take the oaths, may not always sufficiently examine to be able to come to the decision required."

As your Lordship has often subscribed the Declaration in question, it may be gratifying to you to be informed, that you have not in this particular been guilty of that breach of charity which you apprehend. You have not declared the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be idolatrous. Your Lordship and the other Members of the Legislature have on this subject merely declared that the tenet is erroneous; "that in the Sacrament of the Lord's supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ:" and if you have never sufficiently examined the question to enable you to come to this decision, you must pardon me, if I suggest, that it is rather early to begin reading a theological lecture upon it.— You must also pardon me, if I express some degree of surprise, as well as regret, that your Lordship should not only have gone on from Parliament to Parliament, during the whole of your political life, "solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God professing, testifying and declaring," that you believe a certain proposition; but also should have introduced a Bill to expunge that Declaration from the Statute Book, without taking the trouble of informing yourself accurately what it contains. I agree with your Lordship, that "it is too much the practice in every department of our Government to require the taking of oaths; and that one of the consequences of such a practice is to lessen the solemnity of

that awful obligation." But till I had your authority for it, I should not have ventured to suppose, that any sanction (so far as example is a sanction) of that irreverence, which in tidewaiters and excisemen might perhaps less surprise us, should be found in so high a place. Is it indeed too much, that once in six or seven years your Lordships should be called upon to give that security, which, whether wisely or otherwise, the State has judged necessary, and to give it upon your oaths? Is it too much to hope, that these oaths would be taken with at least an understanding of what is done, and not, as your Lordship states, "without consideration, and merely as matters of course?" I am willing to think, that you would not in this instance wish your language to be interpreted according to the letter; that it must rather be viewed in the light of a rhetorical exaggeration:—although another Noble Lord,* who is not accustomed to speak lightly on any subject, talks of the same "solemn mockery" as habitually practised in your august Assembly; and although a Reverend Prelate is stated to have answered† your appeal to his venerable Bench, by owning "for himself, that after having taken such oaths, as the law directed, he had not unfrequently felt a very strong sensation of self-reproach."

My Lord, I know that Reverend Prelate, and to

* Lord Grenville.

† His Lordship's words are thus reported:—"In such solemn transactions as Oaths, care ought to be taken to prevent the conscience from being in any way wounded. He therefore deplored that Members of that House were compelled to make such a declaration as they did when they took their seats; and for himself he could only say, that after having taken such oaths," &c.—*See Morn. Chron. June 11, 1819.*

know is to honour and to love him. I know that he is incapable of thus tampering with his conscience, even for the high honour of a Seat in your Lordship's House. Would that I also knew, that he had sufficient command over his own ardent zeal in a cause which is doubtless near his heart, to prevent him from thus breaking forth into declarations, which scandalize those who know him not, and afflict those who do! He is not one of those Lay Peers, of whom your Lordship thinks it probable, that they have never inquired into the doctrine or practices which they condemn. Long before he sate in Parliament, he must necessarily have inquired and satisfied himself of the truth or falsehood of them. What then can he be supposed to mean, when he speaks of these compunctuous visitings? If there be any want of charity in requiring the test, still there can be none in taking it. He only complies with the law of the land, and discharges a duty by the compliance. Does he disbelieve what he has thus solemnly and knowingly affirmed? It is impossible. Or, even if he does, and if in the hurry, which your Lordship describes, he may once unadvisedly have committed that rash act, which inflicted feelings of so much bitterness, can he have repeated it? can he have *not unfrequently* incurred these very strong sensations of self-reproach? My Lord, I grieve that a mind so upright and conscientious as the venerable Prelate's should be betrayed into the appearance of so much insincerity:—I grieve that so faithful a votary of pure Religion should thus appear to countenance in practice some of the worst errors ever ascribed to the Church of Rome:—I grieve that a Bishop, formed on many accounts to be an ornament of the

Bench on which he sits, should join, in the intemperate blindness of the moment, to fix a stigma and opprobrium upon the Episcopal character, which, if it were just, not even his learning, liberality, benevolence, and Christian meekness, would suffice to wash away.*

* The Bishop of Norwich has since published a Report of his Speech; whether in consequence of the appearance of the former edition of this Letter I do not presume to guess. He does not say, that the Report which I cited is inaccurate, but he gives the following statement of the words used by him from his own recollection.

“ In the course of a protracted life, I never made the declaration in question without experiencing the most unpleasant of all sensations, the sensation of self-reproach; when I recollected, that I had pronounced four parts out of five, of the Christian world, to be superstitious and idolatrous.”

For any difference which there may be between these words, and those cited by me, (if the latter are indeed denied,) I would wish to give the amiable Prelate all the advantage which can be fairly derived from it. To this part of his Lordship's Speech I will not recur.

But I am compelled to say (because it is a matter immediately connected with my main argument) that this is not all which the Bishop has given to the world in his own Report of his Speech. In it he has said, that “ the Declarations contain an *unjust* and vilifying *censure upon the doctrines* of millions of our conscientious fellow Christians.” Does this mean (as it would seem to mean) that the *censure* is *false*? for, how indeed can a *censure* of doctrines (under such circumstances) be *unjust* unless it be *false*?— But if it be *false*, how can the Reverend Prelate affirm it upon his oath?

Would that even this were all! But his Lordship has gone further: he has given us under his own hand the two following sentences. “ I am firmly persuaded, that if it were not for *the ambiguous meaning of the words made use of in this Declaration*, and the *glorious uncertainty of the law, arising from this ambiguity*, there are very many who hear me, who would experience the same misgiving, when they take their seat in either House of Parliament. I do not mean to say, that *with*

But I turn to less painful matters,—to the propositions really contained in the Test.

some ingenuity, a satisfactory mode of making this declaration may not be devised; I have satisfied my own mind; but I am still of opinion, that, upon so solemn an occasion, no ingenuity, no skill in the interpretation of language, should ever be called for."

To these last words I fully assent, and so, in truth, does the legislature: for in the very Declaration, which the Bishop has so often made, and made upon his oath, though always experiencing that bitterest of all sensations, "a sensation of self-reproach," and, "although compelled to *exercise some ingenuity to devise a mode of making it which can satisfy his own mind,*"—in that very declaration the Legislature has required him to say, and *he has said*, "I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof *in the plain and ordinary sense of the words, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever.*"

Here we see that "all ingenuity in devising modes of making the Declaration" is absolutely disclaimed upon oath. The Declaration is to be made "in the plain and ordinary sense of the words, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants." Now, what is the plain and ordinary sense of the following words, so understood? "In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ:" and again: "The Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous."

Is there any ingenuity necessary to find out the plain meaning of these words, as commonly understood by English Protestants? and if that meaning be plain, is not all ingenuity, in devising modes of subscribing to them, excluded upon oath? What and where is the ambiguity of which the Bishop speaks? where is that "glorious uncertainty of the law" in this particular, except in the too subtle mind of its Right Reverend Commentator?

The first is, "that there is no Transubstantiation of the sacramental elements into the body and blood of Christ;" and this is a proposition which, to English Protestants, is attended with as little difficulty as any that can be put. Your Lordship will at once perceive that it involves none of those niceties on which you are pleased to dwell: that all the learning employed by you about Consubstantiation,* the real presence, and whatever is meant by "something like the real presence," is absolutely thrown away; in short, that all that is required is the simple negation of one wild tenet, of which you yourself say, that you, and those whom you address, "must, as Members of the Church of England, of course disbelieve it."

But uncalled for as these topics are, it is nevertheless observable, that the same peculiar infelicity, which has marked every other part of your Lordship's labours in Divinity, has persecuted you even here also. You appear to have confounded the Doctrine of Transubstantiation with that of the real presence, and to have charged every person, who has maintained the latter notion, with admitting the former, or at least with holding what can hardly be distinguished from it. Among others, Archbishop Laud's† sentiments have been made

* His Lordship is reported to have said, that "the Church of England believed in what was called Consubstantiation." But it is quite impossible, that he could have said any such thing; unless, indeed, he takes his notion of the tenets of the Church of England from such authorities as the *Edinburgh Review*, which pronounces us to be Lutherans. See above, p. 61.

† In the Canons made in 1640, notoriously under the direction of Laud, the 7th speaks expressly of the "idolatry committed in the Mass."

the subject of your misconstruction ; with what justice will appear from the following quotation, which will at the same time set your Lordship right both as to the notions of our early Reformers, and as to the passage quoted by you from our Church Catechism. The words are Cranmer's, cited and adopted by Laud :*

“ If you understand by this word *really*, reipsa, that is, in very deede and effectually, so Christ *by the Grace and efficacie of his passion* is indeed and truly present to all his true and holy members. But if ye understand by this word corporaliter, i. e. corporally, so that by the bodie of Christ is understood a naturall body and organicall, the proposition is cleane contrary to the holy word of God.”

I will subjoin Ridley's account of the real presence ; “ I say and believe that there is not only a signification of Christ's bodie set forth by the Sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithfull *the grace of Christ's bodie*, that is, the food of life and immortalitie.”†

It may not be amiss to add, that not only these, but other, Martyrs to the truth, in the reign of Mary, suffered at the stake, chiefly, for holding that very doctrine of the real presence, as expressed above, which the purveyor of theological information to your Lordship has taught you to consider as similar to Transubstantiation.

The next proposition in the Test respects the Invocation of Saints, that it is superstitious and idolatrous.

* Against Fisher, the Jesuit, p. 192.

† Ridley apud Fox Mart. T. iii. p. 64.

On this your Lordship appears to have said nothing, except expressing a pretty strong doubt, whether the House knew "what the (Roman) Catholics mean by the Adoration of the Virgin Mary, or the Worship of Saints." It is not for me to presume to remark on the fitness, or unfitness, of any opinions, which your Lordship may entertain, respecting the indifference of any of your Noble Brethren to one of the plainest duties that can attach to them. That it is their bounden duty to inform themselves on a subject, respecting which they give so solemn an attestation of their belief, will not admit of argument. Happily, in this instance, the duty is very easily discharged: and I may venture to appeal to your Lordship, whether the question respecting the Invocation of Saints is attended with more difficulty, than the meanest problem in political economy which ever engaged your attention.

A Noble Earl, to whose Speech, distinguished by its moderation, I before took the liberty of referring, does not hesitate to say, that he "believes many of the practices of the lower orders of the laity and priesthood in (Roman) Catholic countries to be idolatrous:"—and this, I submit, is sufficient to support the truth of the proposition in the Test. But his Lordship adds, that he "sees no idolatry in the *recommendation* of the Council of Trent, the great authority of that Church."

It is very true that the Decree of the Council does not explicitly say more, than that "it is *good and useful* suppliantly to invoke the Saints, reigning with Christ in Heaven, and to have recourse to their prayers, interest, and assistance, in order to obtain

blessings from God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”* But that no idolatry is implied, even in this case, can scarcely be granted. I am, however, unwilling to trespass on your Lordship’s patience with an argument on the subject: I will only say, that this is a case where, in the purposed absence of all express declaration in the words of the Council, we must form our judgment from the usages which prevail in Roman Catholic countries; and then I think that the Noble Earl will on reflexion extend his condemnation to classes both of the laity and the priesthood above the lower. Let him even look to a most authoritative document, the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which every one admitted to Holy Functions in that Church is bound by oath, not only to believe, but to teach the people. The 20th Article is as follows: “I do likewise firmly hold, that the Saints reigning with Christ *are to be worshipped and invoked*, (venerandos atque invocandos esse,) and that they do offer Prayers unto God for us.” Is not this something more than a recommendation?

The last clause in the Declaration affirms the idolatrous nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

This is a point, on which the office I have undertaken brings me into conflict with the opinions of a Noble Lord, to whom, if the expression of profound respect from so obscure an individual as myself were of any moment, it would be tendered most sincerely. I respect that Noble Lord’s learning, and zeal for learn-

* Sess. xxv.

ing,—his unquestioned fidelity to the cause of true religion,—his firm and upright adherence to the interests of his country, even when they have demanded from him the sacrifice of his party attachments:—I respect him, too, as filling with dignity and honour that high place in the University of Oxford, which yet, as a friend of the consistency of the University, particularly in relation to this very Test, I thought, and still think, ought never to have been opened to him. But the more highly I respect him, the more imperative I feel the duty of opposing sentiments, which, proceeding from such a quarter, are doubly mischievous.

His Lordship denies that the practice of the Church of Rome in the most important article of its worship, the Sacrifice of the Mass, is justly liable to the charge of Idolatry. He makes a distinction, which, in his opinion, both acquits that Church, and allows those, who acquit it, to subscribe the Declaration. The distinction is as follows: “That if Protestants, believing the consecrated elements to be bread and wine, should worship them as God, this would be idolatrous; not so in the case of Roman Catholics, who think them to be really God.”

Let me be permitted briefly to examine the distinction itself, before I inquire into the application of it by the Noble Lord.

In the first place, we must not forget what is included in the belief of the Roman Catholics themselves. They hold that “although the substance of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is annihilated, yet their species remain;” and the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, therefore, together with the species of Bread

and Wine, are the whole formal object of adoration. Now of these species (when the substance is annihilated) I certainly will not pretend to define the nature: but be they what they may, they are, and must be confessed to be, mere creatures. Even, therefore, on the supposition of a real change of substance, creatures of some sort are made to partake of divine worship; a result, which old-fashioned Theology would consider as amounting to Idolatry.

But, 2dly, if a mistake on the part of the Worshipper is to excuse the Worship, it will not be very easy to prove the charge of idolatry against any persons whatever. To give divine worship, ultimately, to any object which the worshippers did not themselves believe to be God, is a flight of impiety which few idolaters ever reached.

3dly, If it be true that, because the Roman Catholics are right in the intended object of their adoration, and mistaken only as to the fact, whether that which they adore be really he, therefore their worship is not idolatrous; then it will follow, that those, who gave divine worship to Simon Magus were not chargeable with idolatry: for they intended to worship "the Great Power of God,"* and were only mistaken as to the fact whether Simon were he. Nay, on this principle, I cannot see that there would be any thing idolatrous in the worship of the Shiloh of those wretched fanatics, whom our own age and country have produced.

The Truth is that all Idolatry, as well as a large portion of the rest of human wickedness, necessarily implies

* Acts, viii. 10.

false opinion ; which, being gross and unreasonable, does not therefore excuse, much less destroy, the sinful nature of the act. Idolatry always arises, immediately, from the blindness of the understanding, in whatever degree it may be remotely referable to the corruption of the heart: and the best that we can say of the worship in question is, that it is a sin of ignorance: which will, we doubt not, be regarded with all merciful indulgence by Him, who alone can know, and will duly estimate, the considerations of every kind, which may extenuate or aggravate its guilt. Meanwhile, let it not be forgotten, that it has been confessed by Roman Catholics themselves, that if the doctrine of Transubstantiation be erroneous, the worship founded on it is idolatrous. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester,* the most learned of English Papists, speaks of this consequence in much stronger terms, than a Protestant would use, and Belarmine,† the ablest advocate of their cause in Rome itself, treats it as a matter of course.

Your Lordship will pardon me, that following so great a leader I have ventured to carry you into an argument purely theological. I will now beg leave to say some-

* Johan. Roff. cont. Œcolamp. l. i. c. ii.

Nulli dubium esse potest, si nihil in Eucharistiâ præter panem sit, quin tota ecclesia jam per xv. annorum centenarios, idololatra fuerit, ac proinde quotquot ante nos hoc sacramentum adoraverint, omnes ad unum esse damnatos. Nam creaturam panis adoraverunt creatoris loco.

† Bell. de Euch. l. iv. c. 29.

Quod ad adorationem attinet, Sacramentarii omnes idololatriam appellant ejusmodi adorationem. Neque id mirum videri debet cum ipsi non credant Christum reipsa esse præsentem, et panem Eucharistiæ nihil esse, nisi panem ex furno.

thing on the application of the distinction, which has been just examined, to the matter in question.

The Noble Lord, who introduces it, is so confident not only of its soundness, but also of its necessity, that he is represented as saying, that "the Declaration cannot be subscribed conscientiously without it." That is, in other words, when a person declares his belief, "that the Sacrifice of the Mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, is idolatrous," he means, and can only conscientiously mean, not what the words express, but a proposition of a very different import: namely, "I believe that the Sacrifice of the Mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, would be idolatrous in my case, if I were to join in it." To make his Lordship's explanation of conscientious subscription the more edifying, I will beg leave to recite the words, which immediately follow, "and I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever." In very sooth, we need not go all the way to Rome, to learn the easiest method to get rid of an inconvenient oath.

But the Noble Lord further remarks on the phrase "as now practised in the Church of Rome," being still continued, "though the ceremony so denounced may have been repeatedly varied, perhaps have been entirely changed, in the interval since the Declaration was framed."

A little reflection will, I am confident, convince his Lordship of the propriety of introducing and of retaining

the phrase. Had it been said simply that "the invocation of Saints and the Sacrifice of the Mass are idolatrous," it might have been objected, that this, on Protestant principles, is not true of all "Invocation of Saints," (such for instance as the mere declamatory Invocation by some of the ancients,) nor of the "Sacrifice of the Mass" in every sense of those words: for the Mass was a title given to the Sacrament before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was established: and as to the term Sacrifice, we ourselves apply it, in a certain sense, both to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and to other religious services. It was necessary, therefore, to limit the condemnation to the practices of the modern and corrupted Church of Rome, as contradistinguished from the ancient, in order to make the Declaration strictly appropriate to its purpose, that of a Test against Popery. As to "the eternal Now,"* we may leave it to be settled with the Roman Catholics themselves. They maintain that "eternal Now," as applicable to all their articles of Faith; and till they abandon (which, while they continue Papists, they never can) those principles on which the practices in question are built, no change, however entire, of the mere circumstantials or ceremonial parts of the service will affect the fair construction of the Test.

The Noble Lord is also represented as saying that "no reasonable man out of doors, not one, he was convinced, of their Lordships, would undertake to say that

* "He remembered a bold expression of one of our poets: 'it was one eternal Now.' Now, this 'one eternal Now' seemed to be the language of the Declaration Oath."—*Lord Grenville's Speech.*

the religion of Fenelon was idolatry; that Fenelon, (he mentioned him merely as a familiar instance out of many,) worshipping according to the sincere dictates of his conscience, was a man to be shunned and degraded as a profane worshipper of idols."

That Idolatry in its mildest form has some tendency to debase the understanding and corrupt the heart, I most firmly believe: but that this tendency always takes effect is more, I conceive, than any reasonable man within or out of doors would venture to affirm. Fenelon's pure, and guileless, and truly evangelical spirit would have done honour to any church or age of Christians: many others of his Communion have, doubtless, merited almost equal praise: to every one such, while I look up with fervent admiration, and a humble and anxious wish that to imitate were as easy as to admire, I would say from the bottom of my heart "*talis cum sis, utinam noster esses!*" But, my Lord, the question is not, whether it be or be not possible for Members of that Communion to be preserved from the corrupting influence of some parts of their religious worship,—to be, by the Divine Grace, in spite of all the errors of their Creed, exemplary for every Christian virtue,—but whether two alleged particulars of that Creed and worship be idolatrous, or not. To disprove the charge by quoting the names of Fenelon or Pascal, is just as reasonable, as if the Athenians had attempted to silence Paul's preaching by a panegyric on Socrates or Aristides.

I may also venture to remark on the palpably exaggerated strain in which his Lordship is pleased to indulge. Does the declaration, that two of the practices of the

Church of Rome are idolatrous, imply that all who join in them *are to be shunned and degraded as profane worshippers of idols?* Again, is his Lordship so bad a logician, (I am sure he is not,) or does he presume that all to whom his words shall reach (and the words of such a man cannot but reach far) are so utterly strangers to the laws of reasoning, as to accept for a legitimate conclusion, that because Fenelon's religious worship was in two particulars idolatrous, therefore the religion of Fenelon was idolatry? We have been taught in the schools, that the fallacy "*a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*" is one of the rudest and clumsiest weapons in the Sophist's armoury. Even the skill and the vigour, with which the Noble Lord is able to wield this and every other intellectual weapon, will hardly secure him from defeat, when he ventures into the field with a blade of no better proof.

But in addition to argument, authority also is brought to sustain the view taken by your Lordship and your Noble Friend of the matters in question. The opinions not only of Sir William Temple, and other respectable laymen, (whose judgment on the *expediency* of a Test would be worthy of regard,) but also of Divines of the Church of England have been quoted against the *truth* of the Declaration. Archbishop Sheldon has been alleged by the Noble Lord with some high commendations of the greatness of his authority.

Of that Prelate it is far from my wish to speak with disrespect; he had many splendid qualities, which, in spite of no light deductions from his episcopal character, will always make his memory honoured, particularly by the Members of that University which he enriched

with an edifice worthy of the high solemnities performed within it. But less than this I cannot say, that it would be difficult to name a man in the whole series of English Primates since the Reformation, whose opinion ought to carry with it less weight. I appeal to the character given of him by Burnet:* it will thence be seen, (making, as perhaps we ought to make, large allowances for the prejudices of the Historian,) to how little attention Sheldon's judgment is entitled in a question of theology. But, after all, what proof is there, that Sheldon held the opinion ascribed to him? I know not the grounds on which the Noble Lord spoke. But the only scrap of evidence, which I can find, is in Burnet's account of an interview to which he was himself invited by James II. when Duke of York, evidently with the purpose of gaining him to his party. "Stillingfleet had a little before this time, (A. D. 1673,) published a book of the Idolatry and Fanaticism of the Church of Rome. Upon that the Duke said he asked Sheldon, if it was the doctrine of the Church of England, that Roman Catholics are Idolators: who answered him, it was not; but that young men of parts would be popular: and such a charge was the way to it."†

Now upon this I might remark, that it by no means follows, that Sheldon, if his words were advisedly spoken and correctly repeated, did not hold the opinion, that the practices in question are idolatrous: for all that he says amounts to this, that the Church of England does not require her members to hold it: and, in truth, such is the exemplary moderation of that Church, that,

* Burnet's Hist. v. i. p. 177.

† The same, p. 346.

satisfied with restraining persons from falling into the errors of Rome, she no where explicitly makes that requisition, though the Idolatry in the Sacrifice of the Mass follows as a consequence from her doctrine. But I waive this consideration; and will rather contend, that the evidence itself is too slight to be worthy of attention. That Burnet reported honestly, I have no doubt; that James did so, in a manner which touched so closely his prejudices and his feelings, is more than I am prepared to say; least of all, can I admit, that the real words of a consummate Politician, in answer to such a question from the Heir presumptive to the Throne, himself an avowed Papist, have come down to us accurately attested through this hearsay of a hearsay.

But it has been said, that "Burnet* himself doubted the propriety of applying the term *idolatrous* to doctrines of the Church of Rome." If he did, he must have satisfied himself, that his doubts were unfounded; for he repeatedly took the Test, and he was not a man who would proceed to so solemn an act lightly and insincerely.

Again, Burnet has been quoted by your Lordship, as mentioning that at the framing of the Declaration "the Bishop of Ely (Gunning) objected to it, and contended that the practice of the Church of Rome, in the administration of the Eucharist, could not be called idolatrous." It is very true that Burnet says so: but I am quite sure your Lordship trusted to some other per-

* This is so contrary to the known opinions of Burnet, that I apprehend there must be some mistake in the Report of this part of the Speech.

son for the accuracy of the statement. Your noble mind would, I am confident, have disdained to strengthen your cause by a partial quotation. You will rather be glad to be set right; and to be informed, that in the very same place where Burnet says what you have quoted, he adds, tho' "Gunning had said that he could not take that test with a good conscience, yet as soon as the Bill was past, he took it in the crowd with the rest."* This Bishop of Ely, therefore, was of a contrary opinion to what your Lordship supposes; unless you think that language used in the heat of debate is to be taken as a stronger testimony of the Bishop's sentiments, than his deliberate declaration upon oath. If his character justified such a suspicion, it would not be of much moment what he said or thought. Evelyn, however, who knew him well, had a better opinion of him: he uniformly speaks of him in the highest terms, and, with reference to our present subject, he gives us the following anecdote:—"1678, Nov. 15, I went with S^r W^m Godolphin a Member of the Commons House to y^e B^p of Ely to *be resolv'd whether masses were idolatry as the Test express'd it*, w^{ch} was so worded that several good Protestants scrupl'd, and S^r W^m, tho' a learned man and excellent divine himself, had some doubts about it. The Bishop's opinion was that he might take it, tho' he wish'd it had been otherwise worded in the Test."†—In this wish many would concur: I frankly confess myself to be of the number.

* Burnet, vol. i. p. 436.

† Evelyn's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 475.

Such are the alleged authorities against the truth of the doctrines affirmed in the Test: After a minute, and I fear tedious, examination they are found, if I mistake not, to strengthen the cause which they were brought to overthrow.

And here I should conclude, but that there yet remains one part of your Lordship's Speech, to which even the length of the observations I have already made must not deter me from animadverting. It is one that affects the honour of the Church, of which I am a Minister, more immediately than any thing which has preceded.

Your Lordship, in allusion to the acknowledged tenet of the Roman Church, that there is no Salvation out of its pale, is represented as having "appealed to the Right Reverend Prelates whom you saw before you, whether the 18th Article of the Church of England, or that part of the Liturgy which it had been the well known wish of our pious Sovereign to see withdrawn, are *congenial to the pure Spirit of Christianity*."

It does not appear, from the reports of the debate, that any of those Reverend Prelates thought it necessary to answer this appeal. If they did not, it was doubtless because they were convinced that the answer to it either was familiar to the Noble Auditory, whom your Lordship was addressing, or involved subjects ill suited to the agitation of a debate. As, however, your Speech has gone forth into the world, where it attracts the attention of those who are not equally prepared to meet it, I trust that, having taken upon me to remark

on other particulars, I shall not be deemed presumptuous, if I add a few words on this point likewise.

The part of our Liturgy to which your Lordship refers is, I conclude, the Athanasian Creed. If the King ever entertained the wish supposed, (I know not that he did,) it is deeply to be lamented that a Prince, whose piety and zeal in the cause of true religion were the most distinguished part of his eminently virtuous character (we have now the melancholy privilege of expressing our sense of his rare excellence, without incurring the suspicion of flattery) should in the warmth of his charity have been induced to sanction, what it can scarcely be doubted that his judgment, exercised deliberately, would have led him to disapprove. But let the casual, or the deliberate, expression of our Sovereign's wish be vaunted to the utmost, by those who are not in general inclined to defer largely to his opinions,—and let the liberality of the age brand, as it may, the bigoted avowal,—I scruple not to profess my firm conviction, that the Creed in question is not only true in its doctrine, but most highly serviceable in its use.

The object of the Creed is to proclaim belief in those great and distinguishing doctrines of our religion, the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, and the Incarnation of the blessed Son; doctrines which they who hold them cannot but esteem of essential importance, for on them depends the honour which is due to our Redeemer and our Sanctifier. It is true, that a simpler profession of Faith sufficed for the infant Church; that before the Divinity of the second and third Persons (implied in the Apostles' Creed) was assailed by

heretics, it was not deemed necessary to depart from the simple words of Scripture. But when the words of Scripture were used in a sense, which depraved its meaning, and dishonoured the object of Christian worship, it became necessary to guard the true faith by an exposition, which the subtlety of the adversary could not pervert. The Creed in question effects this purpose: it both states plainly what Scripture teaches of each of the Divine Persons, and also introduces distinctions, which prevent the unwary from being misled by those who, under the words of Scripture, maintain opinions inconsistent with its highest truths. But these distinctions need not be regarded by any who hold the main doctrine.

The condemning or cautionary clauses (call them which you will,) apply to the Catholic Faith generally, and to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation in particular: and he who taxes them as uncharitable, would do well to remember, that as they say not less, so neither do they say more, than our Lord himself pronounced of every one "that believeth not." The only question which can be raised is about the truth of the doctrine; for they who admit it to be true, must see that it is fundamental; and if fundamental, that the denial of it must come within that denunciation, which He, who is emphatically styled "Love," forbore not to make. Do we think that the expression of our Lord, general and unlimited as it is, does yet admit of all merciful allowance for non-belief arising from invincible or excusable ignorance, and for misbelief arising from mere error, from prejudice, from education, from unhappy circumstances of any kind? So also we understand the

Creed. It applies the same solemn sanction of our Lord to the truths which He commissioned his Apostles to teach; and leaves it unlimited as He left it. The presumption would have been not in adopting his language, but in qualifying what He has not authorized man to qualify: the want of charity, not in announcing the danger to which infidelity is exposed, but in dissembling or extenuating it. If the Creed be not expressed, as it might, and probably would be expressed, if it were drawn up anew, it is sufficient to say, that the advantage of adhering to an ancient and recognized formulary more than counterbalances any prospect of amended diction. And so much of the Athanasian Creed.

What your Lordship says of the 18th Article is only a fresh proof, how little consideration even persons of honourable and liberal minds sometimes think it necessary to use, before they condemn the tenets of a Church to which they profess to belong. If your Lordship had not trusted to the representation of others, but had read the Article yourself, I think that you would not have uttered your hasty censure: if you had read it attentively, I am sure that you would not.

The Article anathematizes those "that presume to say that every man shall be saved *by* the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved." It condemns, we see, the impiety of holding that men may be saved by virtue of any false religion: but it does not deny that God, for Christ's sake, will extend his saving

mercy to innumerable multitudes of all nations and countries, even of those who never heard of the name of Christ: it only affirms, that whosoever are saved, are saved by virtue of that holy name, whether they have heard of it or not. If your Lordship really thinks that this is not "congenial to the pure Spirit of Christianity," I dare not forbear telling you (the words, my Lord, are used in no invidious sense) that you have yet to learn what "the pure Spirit of Christianity" is.

I will not trespass longer on your Lordship's attention. I should not indeed have trespassed at all, had I not thought it necessary, that some Member of the Church of England should protest publicly against opinions as injurious to the honour of that Church, as they are destitute of all solid foundation. If any thing that I have said shall induce you to inquire more minutely into the tenets, which we maintain, my labour will not be lost. From a mind ingenuous as your Lordship's is, inquiry is all that we need to ask. The result, I confidently predict, could not be unfavourable: it would enable us to number among the friends of the Church, a nobleman whose virtues would do honour, as his abilities would add strength, to any cause he may be persuaded to support.

I am, my Lord,

With great respect,

Your Lordship's most humble Servant,

A CLERGYMAN OF THE DIOCESE OF
DURHAM.

Durham, 30th June, 1819.

L O N D O N :
PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.





239
P547

122183

PHILLPOTTS, HENRY

239
P547

122183

PHILLPOTTS, HENRY
LETTERS TO CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ...

